

FBIS

DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 203

21 October 1986

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

'International Panorama' Special on Disarmament [Bovin, Falin, Arbatov, Chervov]	AA 1
Chernyshev Terms Arguments for SDI 'Absurd'	AA 8
Richard Perle Stresses SDI To Continue [Pakhomov]	AA 9
Arbatov on Reykjavik, Disarmament Feasibility [Buenos Aires CLARIN 19 Oct]	AA 10
Falin on Reykjavik 'Investment,' New Initiative [DPA]	AA 11
Chernyshev: 'Real Progress' Possible in Geneva	AA 12
Karpov 17 Oct Briefing on Reykjavik Cited	AA 13
USSR Intentions [IZVESTIYA 19 Oct]	AA 13
SDI Obstacle	AA 14
Observers Analyze Reykjavik Motivations [Bovin, Shishlin, Levin]	AA 15

UNITED STATES & CANADA

U.S. Continues Reykjavik 'Propaganda' Campaign	A 1
Reagan Grand Forks Speech [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 19 Oct]	A 1
Distortion of Soviet ABM Stance [Georgiyev in PRAVDA 18 Oct]	A 1
Shevardnadze, U.S. Envoy Discuss Ties, Reykjavik	A 3
U.S. Satellites Photograph Objects in C. Asia [Peace and Progress]	A 4

NORTHEAST ASIA

IZVESTIYA Reports Batmonh-Rogachev Talks [16 Oct]	C 1
Mongolia's Dugersuren Makes Moscow Stopover [IZVESTIYA 16 Oct]	C 1
Aristov Discusses Trade With Japanese Official [IZVESTIYA 17 Oct]	C 1
TASS on 'New Stage' in Soviet-Japanese Relations	C 2
Borodin Views U.S.-Japan 'Provocative Maneuvers' [Nulov]	C 3
Moscow Commentator Viktorov on Ties With DPRK	C 3
Late Report: Kapitsa Briefs Tokyo on Reykjavik	C 5

SOUTH ASIA

Departing Antiaircraft Unit Lauded at Kabul Fete	D 1
Kapitsa Meets With Indian Officials on Reykjavik	D 2
Dobrynin Receives Indian Delegation in Moscow	D 2

Gromyko Receives Indian Envoy; Ties Discussed D 3
Vavilov Hits U.S. Centcom Chief's Pakistan Visit D 3

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Cambodia Accuses Thais of Escalating War E 1
[Gatselyuk in IZVESTIYA 16 Oct]
Commentary Views U.S. Arms Stockpile in Thailand E 1
[Zhukova]

EASTERN EUROPE

Further on Shevardnadze Visit to Romania F 1
Meeting With Totu [IZVESTIYA 17 Oct] F 1
Meeting With Ceausescu [PRAVDA 16 Oct] F 1
Further on Ceausescu Meeting F 2
Shevardnadze Press Conference F 2
Returns to Moscow F 5
Communique on Visit F 5
Ceausescu Notes Importance of Reykjavik F 6
CPCZ Delegation Received by Yeltsin, Others F 7
[PRAVDA 19 Oct]
Orzechowski Makes Stopover en Route to Far East F 7
Hungarian Defense Minister Awarded Soviet Order F 7
[PRAVDA 16 Oct]

WESTERN EUROPE

Karpov, Others Brief West European Officials G 1
Bessmertnykh Rome News Conference G 1
[Milan L'UNITA 16 Oct]
Ryzhkov Greets Danish Prime Minister on Arrival G 2
Ryzhkov, Schluter Hold Talks G 2

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Shabayev: Mosad Behind Kidnapping of Israeli H 1

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Joint Statement on Argentine President's Visit K 1
[PRAVDA 18 Oct]
Brutents Ends Argentina Visit, Arrives Panama K 6
[PRAVDA 3 Oct]
Shevardnadze, Cuban Envoy Hold 'Friendly' Talks K 7
Soviet Ambassador to Brazil Replaced K 7
[PRAVDA 5 Oct]

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Ligachev, Others Address Social Science Forum R 1
[PRAVDA 2 Oct]

Politburo Figures Attend Council of Ministers
Turkmen CP Sacks, Expels Atayev, Mollayev

R 18
R 18

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Agricultural Developments for 15-18 Oct Reported
Progress of Harvest, Winter Crops Noted
Paper Views Early October Weather, Crops
[Orlova in SELSKAYA ZHIJZN 16 Oct]

T 1
T 3
T 3

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Shcherbitskiy, Military Sign General's Obituary
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Oct]
Militia Major Decorated for Bravery 8 Oct
[IZVESTIYA 9 Oct]

V 1
V 1

We have a clear and precise aim. We are ready to give a lot to achieve it, to have it implemented. But what we are asking for here is a clear and precise response. There has been enough playing with very important questions, playing with fire. On this level the proposals remain, but they remain as a package. The Americans -- and this came to light at the meeting -- would not be opposed to swallowing down all the concessions they can get now, leaving the rest until better times. But that is not happening we won't do it; these proposals are on the table as a package.

[Sommer] It would be useful if you could just explain again in detail the contents of your package.

[Chervov] We made it clear to the American side that we are ready for radical reductions in heavy intercontinental missiles. The U.S. experts were told that as regards the medium-range problem, the matter of Britain and France is dropped. Thus, at the meeting of experts the U.S. side saw that the Soviet Union is making earnest moves forward. At the same time we told the U.S. side quite firmly that space tests of ABM components must be banned under any circumstances.

[Falin] It came to light quite quickly that the U.S. position remains somewhat different. This is reflected in the President's review statement which you and anybody can read, that in Reykjavik the United States was trying to pursue its policy from a position of strength. I think that it is here, in the incompatibility as it was displayed between the two philosophies -- the philosophy of a policy of force put forward at the present stage by the U.S. Administration, and the philosophy of good-neighbor cooperation and of universal not unilateral security put forward by the Soviet side -- that one can find the main reason for the fact that, in the final analysis, the meeting failed to reach a common denominator, to find one and lay the basis for all the development to follow.

[Ruehe] This could not be the deciding meeting. It was a preliminary meeting, a preliminary meeting prior to a summit meeting. I think what we need is a policy by steps, a step-by-step policy. I would be in favor of such a policy of consistent steps, to avoid getting stuck. I would like to repeat the question: What does it mean when you talk of a package? That is, is the Soviet Union going back on its position? That would contradict what you are saying, namely that you are making a new policy, a new philosophy.

[Sommer] Perhaps, Mr Falin, we must try to gain from your side a precise response to the main question. Is what you proposed in Reykjavik a package which cannot be undone. General Secretary Gorbachev said in his speech that if SDI is not given up then all the rest, everything we have tried to do here, all of this will fail. Is that really the case?

[Falin] If what the United States said in Reykjavik, if the lock which with the help of SDI they put on the process or tried to put on the process of real arms reduction, is a general NATO position, then to me personally the future looks more gloomy than it has hitherto. Specifically, this is why: Agreements and treaties are concluded not to be interpreted as people see fit but to be fulfilled -- at least that is how I understand it.

If Article 5 of the 1972 treaty speaks directly of a ban on the development of components for systems and testing them -- that is, all systems apart from ground-based systems, stationary ground-based systems are specially stipulated -- and there is a ban on the testing and development of space-based components while NATO, as you say, on the whole, considers that this is only a wish and not a pledge, a question arises: Why conclude agreements and treaties in general?

[Ruehe] We consider the U.S. research to be justified within the framework of the ABM Treaty which was concluded in 1972 between the USSR and the United States, and with the precise interpretation of the U.S. side up to this time with regard to its allies.

[Falin] If you agree with this U.S. interpretation, then together with the United States you are destroying the 1972 treaty. I can say one thing: Although SDI has not yet been built as an operational system, it is already collecting its victims, and the first victim of this SDI program is the opportunity to achieve radical reductions -- you understand how important they are -- in strategic weapons, or to be more precise, central strategic systems.

[Ruehl] We understand your argument and your reasoning; we also refuse to accept your philosophy and your psychological reaction just as we ask you to understand our European reactions which stem from a position of strategic weakness.

[Bertram] I know how many Europeans I am speaking for. We Europeans are very skeptical about the complete elimination of nuclear weapons because we consider that parity in the field of conventional weapons is not tantamount to equal security. I think that nuclear weapons, as before, are necessary for the security of Western Europe. Of course, that does not necessarily mean medium-range missiles. But what is at issue are systems that guarantee real deterrence in the nuclear sphere and in the field of conventional weapons -- that guarantee that there is no point in attack.

[Chervov] As far as I know the FRG Government has always favored and supported the Soviet initiative on stopping nuclear tests. In any case, in January this year Chancellor Kohl spoke out directly in favor of stopping nuclear tests. But now, suddenly, the FRG Government has gone through a complete about-face and is now expressing a completely different viewpoint. In particular my esteemed colleague, Mr Ruehl, has stated it straight out and repeated the U.S. position: While nuclear weaponry exists there must be nuclear tests. I have a question: What has caused the change in your position on nuclear tests?

[Ruehe] The FRG's position has not changed; the aim remains as before: It is a question of a treaty on banning tests. But it is necessary to agree on the path that leads there. We think it is necessary to agree on new limitations on the strength of blasts and on the number of nuclear tests. I mean, achieving an all-embracing ban on tests. The aim is clear, but it is not a question of all or nothing -- it is a matter of a gradual movement, of the further development of the process, the method of verification. There are concrete proposals on that issue on the German side, and there is a readiness for participation in the development and setting up of the corresponding equipment.

[Chervov] Is it really not possible now to ban nuclear tests immediately? Why is such a long-term objective being set; why is it that this position, this problem is being postponed to some later date, till kingdom come? Why can't nuclear tests be stopped now, immediately?

[Ruehl] The question of ending nuclear tests must not be considered wholly isolated from a reduction of existing nuclear arms. The FRG's policy consists of pointing out that connection, and in not forgetting demands for a considerable reduction in nuclear arms, in its appeals for a refusal to carry out nuclear tests. I expressed doubt that the nuclear powers -- not the Soviet Union and the United States, although these are the leading nuclear powers, but all nuclear powers -- as long as they have arsenals of nuclear weapons, in fact, over a long period of time, will refuse to carry out nuclear tests.

I still doubt this today, but these doubts do not include the FRG's policy, which is entirely clear, and which I represent.

[Bertram] Another question: I was surprised that the Soviet Union is advocating a complete end to nuclear tests so definitely, and explains that the arms race can be halted in that way. I think that no such relation exists.

[Chervov] You say that nuclear tests will not end the arms race. No, stopping them will end it. The question arises: Who needs nuclear tests? You analyze the U.S. nuclear tests. Only the Department of Energy is carrying out tests, which is developing new types of weapons. If there are no nuclear tests, there will be no new types of weapons. Will that end this arms race? Of course it will. Therefore, I cannot agree with you at all, that nuclear tests do not have any significance for the arms race. There is a difference between the U.S. position and yours, on this problem. You say it is necessary to ratify treaties; we are ready for that, please let us ratify them. You say monitoring -- there is no problem of monitoring. You have been told that we are prepared even to allow any representatives onto our test range, and let them live there, and let them monitor. There is no monitoring problem. What is the problem then? It is a problem of a reluctance to stop nuclear blasts. You say you don't have any nuclear weapons. But we know the role and place of the FRG. We know the role, place and influence of the FRG on the United States. Therefore, to stand aside on this issue would be -- at least, I think it would be -- to underestimate the role and status of the FRG.

[Ruehe] Now for the first time I have the feeling that we are not talking to each other, but trying to persuade each other.

[Falin] This isn't persuasion, this is only a description of the situation. Now you have, we have given you, as we say, such a chance -- that is, we have given you an opportunity to resolve all your internal arguments at a time when nobody can accuse the Soviet Union of making some kind of special efforts in the field of armaments. But you, for reasons which are not altogether clear to us, are not making use of that opportunity.

[Chervov] One more remark on what Valentin Mikhaylovich has said: Ratification of treaties, reducing capabilities, a quota on nuclear tests -- all this is good. But we have declared to the U.S. side: How can this be resolved? Let's start talks now, immediately. Let's sit down at the discussion table, and conduct talks under the heading of a complete ban on nuclear weapons tests -- that is, where we will determine a time limit, and will resolve all these issues. But after all, if one simply does not go to the talks, that is a declaration which is of no use to anyone. That will really be persuasion.

[Falin] According to U.S. data, 86 percent of the blasts were designed for new weapons.

[Arbatov] Of course. I should like to say this on that score: By ending nuclear blasts, the most dangerous course of the arms race ends: the development of new types of weapons. It is much easier to deal with quantities in this case, as everyone knows, than with new qualities, which make the old equations meaningless, and force one to run around in circles with talks. In other words, we are discussing yesterday's problems all the time, while new types of weapons are appearing.

[Ruehe] I need half a minute to return to Mr Arbatov's statements again. If someone were to listen to us now, from Mars, for example, who didn't know the situation on Earth, he would probably think that you are representatives of a small state which does not have nuclear weapons. He would not think that you are a representatives of a major state that has a huge number of nuclear weapons. But after all, your state has tens of thousands of nuclear warheads, and my state has no nuclear weapons.

[Falin] You do not possess nuclear weapons, indeed. But I don't know what is better or worse. There are thousands of nuclear warheads on your territory which are not at your disposal. Their fate was enshrined in Omaha long ago, without you -- where they are to fly, how, and why. That is an issue which cannot be put aside so easily -- you don't have them, they are not at your disposal, and therefore you cannot say a single word about such problems as nuclear weapons. Life is more complicated than that; life is more complicated. Let's see it in all its various aspects.

A second point: In spite of numerous attempts, we haven't understood what the United States is carrying out nuclear weapons tests for, and why you are so keen on the U.S. tests. I want to recall that in the 1970's we made progress, there was an advance, after we and the United States agreed that there is no rational alternative to peaceful coexistence, that it is the duty of both sides to be concerned with preventing nuclear war, that all the problems of disarmament must be resolved on the basis of the principle of equality and mutual security. At the meeting in Reykjavik, we were told of the following principle: equality and fairness. Mutual security vanished. Fairness, according to the U.S. definition, and according to ours, means things which are far from compatible. What is fair for the United States -- siting weapons in the Eastern Hemisphere -- seems unfair to them if somebody's weapons appear in the Western Hemisphere. I want to formulate one idea, precisely and clearly, in an unorthodox form, perhaps: There cannot be Soviet truth and U.S. truth. There is one single truth which exists, which we must find by joint efforts, and with which we must implement our treaties.

[Ruehl] It is of course essential to think, too, about the political will of those who are designing strategy, and not only about technical capabilities. The political thinking behind both the U.S. and the Atlantic strategy as a whole is not aimed at preparing for an aggressive war, and even less at an initial disarming strike against the Soviet Union. It is a strategy aimed at preserving stability -- to prevent war. This system of coordinates also includes such experiments as the Strategic Defense Initiative. We have heard here that you perceive in this an attempt to establish U.S. world domination. I must tell you that I cannot see the logic in those thoughts.

[Falin] During a recent hearing in the U.S. Congress -- the issue concerning the state of development of military technology in the United States and in the Soviet Union -- the Pentagon reported the following: Of 12 main forms of military technology, the U.S. is ahead of the Soviet Union in 10; there is equality in 2 of them. The Soviet Union does not lead the United States in any one of the important systems, according to the Pentagon's information. I repeat, this is a U.S. assessment, which is a confirmation, in particular, of the efficiency of the expenditure of money allocated by the Pentagon, and of the organization of the corresponding work. So there cannot be two kinds of truth; there must be a single truth: Either the United States is ahead of us, as they maintain, or something else is going on, attempts to convince the public that the Soviet Union has overtaken the United States, and the United States must catch up. They say one thing to the public, another to their senators. There is a proverb for that: Your previous lie threatens, harms, your present truth.

[Chervov] One cannot make declarations about peace and about disarmament and at the same time defend star wars and undermine the ABM Treaty. The SDI and the ABM Treaty are incompatible -- they are antipodes. The ABM Treaty is the basis of Soviet-U.S. relations, the basis for stability in the international situation. Jumping ahead, I will tell you my viewpoint: that it is not SDI which represents stability, but the ABM Treaty which represents a strengthening of the stability of the international situation. If the ABM Treaty falls through, a game without rules will begin. We will not establish another treaty like it, and the task, in my opinion, of all diplomats, politicians, and soldiers, is to fight for the preservation of the ABM Treaty, whatever camp, whatever society we live or find ourselves in. If the United States, at the moment, has in fact, because of SDI, wrecked ready nuclear arms accords, then apparently it is doubtful whether in the future it will take the ABM Treaty into account.

[Ruehl] I don't represent the U.S. viewpoint here, that is not my business. I can only talk about our own assessments of the strategic situation, and to present these assessments, and I will talk from this point of view. You know that the FRG Government supports the U.S. SDI program; this political support applies to the defense initiative, but it does not apply to any offensive strategy whatsoever aimed at achieving strategic superiority, or to an offensive threat against the Soviet Union or other states with the aid of nuclear or postnuclear weapons systems, i.e., weapons systems developed through the revolution in technology.

The Federal Government supports President Reagan's project, the SDI project, as a means of maintaining strategic stability with other weapons systems and other technologies -- in other words, against nuclear weapons.

[Chervov] This is not a revelation for us, we know this very well. I only want to say once again that there is not even a whiff of the defensive here. It is a play on words. It is just like, as in his time one great person said, entering a shoe brush in the order of the mammals -- that doesn't mean that it will grow mammary teats. [laughter] This is just as absolutely accurate. The Federal Government is blindly following the United States on this issue, and does not want to examine the essence of the issue. Well, that is very sad.

Recently in Bel Air, on 8 October, Mr Reagan said: We will develop [sozdavat] SDI, and develop [sozdavat] space-strike weapons, and we will fulfill all the programs for strategic offensive weapons and build up our nuclear potential. You say that SDI is technology, that it is a harmless device; we say that it is a weapon. So there is a need for our colleagues to examine once again what SDI is, what sort of military program it is, and when you tell us here that the U.S. strategy is aimed at strengthening stability, and that SDI is aimed at this, then believe us too that, on the contrary, SDI leads precisely to the destabilization of the international situation....

[Falin, interrupting] That is the aim of SDI, it doesn't simply lead.

[Chervov] Yes, and if SDI components are taken outside the confines of the laboratory, then we will approach a limit beyond which unpredictable events will begin, and there will be no going back. I can tell you with confidence that the security of the United States, and your security, will not be increased by this.

[Sommer] Mr General, you have again returned to the issue of SDI. We have understood your message, and I think that -- I can say this frankly on my own behalf, and on behalf of Mr Christoph Bertram at any rate -- that we share many of your doubts, and we would have liked the U.S. President not to have allowed possible agreements in Reykjavik to collapse, but we think that not all is lost.

[Bertram] In the United States, even among the supporters of SDI, there is concern over the fact that the transience of strategic fashion in the United States will lead to the United States abandoning SDI at some point. Nevertheless, in the meantime, the Soviet Union will become convinced that SDI is the best thing that exists in this world, that the Soviet Union's huge military-bureaucratic machine will reorganize itself towards SDI -- that is, the time may possibly come when we will be calling on you to adhere to the ABM Treaty, and you will tell us: Why? It is all clear.

[Chervov] It is very tempting for you to convince yourselves that the Soviet Union is developing [sozdayet] an SDI like the U.S. one. I will tell you that we don't have such programs; we are not developing [sozdayem] an SDI. We have offered to the U.S. side to ban everything that is being done in this field, and we are ready to open our laboratories. What more do you need? What other proofs do you still need? We are opening all our laboratories, and are placing everything under monitoring, so that here there are not only our assurances, but also our practical actions. Why does the U.S. side not go for this?

[Sommer] I am convinced that on both sides, of course, there are still questions, but I am afraid at the moment we will not be able to reply to these questions, and there is not time to ask them. It may yet be possible to do this in private conversation, maybe. I now propose that every participant say a few words in conclusion for 3 to 5 minutes, and in doing so, look more to the future, although we could of course return to a theme which we have already talked about, or to assess the emphasis. My proposal is: Mr Ruehl, General Chervov, Lothar Ruehe, Mr Falin, and then Christoph Bertram.

[Ruehl] I would like to draw up the results, or the interim results. It is with great satisfaction that I, as a German politician, ascertain the noticeable improvement in relations between the FRG and the Soviet Union which has begun to show in recent months. I would like to stress once again our readiness to develop relations constantly on the basis of the Moscow treaty. One should not be bound by rhetorical statements in relations between West and East, but one should use political dialogue to a greater extent, a dialogue in which all European states should be taking part, and to which they should all be making their contribution. In this sense the forthcoming Vienna conference of countries participatory to the Helsinki treaty is being given very great significance, and we are full of the resolve to use this process. I would like to say that we will continue to treat Soviet initiatives with great regard and all seriousness, and we attach great significance to the continuation of the exchange of opinions. The Federal chancellor has emphasized this in his address to the general secretary, and I can say on behalf of my faction in the Bundestag that I am pleased that on 23 November I will be here with a delegation of the CSD/CSU faction. We will be holding conversations here on economic problems as well; we look forward to these talks. I thank you.

[Sommer] I am confident that General Chervov, unlike you, will be militarily brief.

[Chervov] I thank our colleagues for the frank conversation. It has gone very properly. We have not hidden anything from each other, we have spoken frankly. Briefly, I would like to say the following: At the moment, you yourselves all feel that, on the part of the Soviet Union, on issues of war and peace, issues of disarmament, there is a new approach, and new thinking. Not only that, there's also a new practical policy.

We not only put forward initiatives, we also confirm them by practical acts. That's the first thing. The second thing is that we must advance a specific attitude to the ABM treaty, and understand that it is the only foundation on which strategic stability is being maintained, as well as Soviet-U.S. relations, and normal international relations in general.

[Ruehl] We see in the negotiations on control of conventional weapons from the Atlantic to the Urals an important political prospect, a prospect for security. Whether this chance is used, and whether it can be used, will depend in the first instance on how we make use of the results of the Stockholm conference, how successful we will be in translating them from the language on paper to the language of action. To conclude, I would like to express my thanks for the way in which these conversations were conducted here, for your frankness, and for your willingness to hear us out. I am also grateful for the amicable tone of this discussion to our Soviet partners.

[Bertram] I am doubtful as to whether there are premises for both world powers going for arms control. I think they are acting according to the principle of all or nothing.

[Falin] Inasmuch as there's no time left, I'll begin with the English statement that, if I do not reply to some arguments or questions which have been raised on the West German side, it does not mean that I agree with everything that was said. I think that this roundtable has shown the great opportunities for an honest, frank, and business-like discussion of very difficult issues which are on the agenda and awaiting a solution. At the same time, our exchange of opinions has shown that, on a number of issues, there is a great misunderstanding of one another's real positions; there are, at the same time, great divergences as well in approach, which include a fundamental approach to a number of issues. The famous, esteemed, and honored Niels Bohr once said: Maybe opposites do not contradict, but complement each other? This was talking about opinions, world views, and so on. Maybe. On one condition: If these same differences, these same opposites are not negated by the weapons already available, and even worse already being developed [sozdayetsya]. Whether we are going to live as neighbors with each other peacefully, in good fashion, depends on us together, with all our differences.

[Sommer] Cordial thanks, and goodbye until the next time, I hope, in the Federal Republic of Germany. [end video recording]

CHERNYSHEV TERMS ARGUMENTS FOR SDI 'ABSURD'

LD181552 Moscow TASS in English 1417 GMT 18 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 18 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev:

After the Soviet-U.S. summit in Reykjavik it became absolutely clear to the whole world that SDI, or "star wars" program, is the main obstacle to reaching agreement on reduction and, finally, elimination of nuclear arms, on the road to a world without nuclear arms.

Particularly surprising is the reasoning of the President of the USA about the "need" for SDI even if strategic offensive arms are eliminated.

The White House came up with two arguments: first, that the anti-missile "shield" will allegedly be a guarantee that the Soviet Union is honouring agreement, second, that it will protect the USA if some maniac will get hold of a missile with a nuclear charge.

Both arguments are simply absurd. First, if two great powers are seeking agreement on an extremely serious step, joint elimination of offensive strategic arms, this, undoubtedly, must promote a sharp increase of mutual confidence. If confidence is lacking it will be useless to embark on such an undertaking. At the same time, there must be absolute clarity about verification in order to ensure complete confidence that the obligations adopted are being implemented. And the Soviet leader said firmly in Reykjavik that in view of the readiness to make deep cuts in nuclear arms, in connection with embarking on a concrete stage of the elimination of nuclear weapons, verification must become tougher. The USSR confirmed its readiness for any form of verification. It declared for triple verification which should guarantee absolute confidence for each side that it would not be led into a trap. To propose to accumulate large amounts of weapons in space and to try to pass these weapons as "system of control" is not serious, to say the least. What is more, it is ridiculous.

Let us consider the second "argument," so to say, about a "maniac" who might get it into his head to prevail over the "defenseless", non-nuclear United States. Such a script can clearly be traced to the Hollywood. But even the notorious Hollywood hit [as received] managed to get by without a system of the "star wars" type and without nuclear explosions. Seriously speaking, how can pragmatic American taxpayers seriously contemplate the spending of thousands of billions of dollars to inundate outer space with space weaponry platforms, guiding themselves by the idea of the possible arrival of a "mythical personality" that will be able to manufacture hundreds of nuclear charges in secret (a large-scale system must be ready to rebuff an ambushed strike, or else why concoct all this)?

Elementary logic dictates this: If agreement is sought for scrapping swords, then there is no need for shields. But if a shield is actually conceived as an addition to a sword, there is nothing to camouflage this. Mankind is not to be misled.

RICHARD PERLE STRESSES SDI TO CONTINUE

LD202149 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1530 GMT 20 Oct 86

[Text] London, 20 Oct (TASS) -- TASS correspondent Nikolay Pakhomov reports: The U.S. intention to continue implementation of the star wars program and the absence of any sincere desire on Washington's part to aim for a reduction and liquidation of nuclear weapons arsenals are the main reasons that an arms control accord was not reached in Reykjavik. This was reaffirmed by statements made by Richard Perle, U.S. assistant secretary of defense, who has arrived in Great Britain to take part in a regular session of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group, which opens tomorrow in Glenagles (Scotland). In an interview for BBC television, the "hawk" stated that he was "as proud and happy as he could be" that the Soviet-American meeting in Reykjavik was not crowned with an agreement.

R. Perle stressed that the U.S. Administration intends to continue at full speed with work on the 'Strategic Defense Initiative,' having made it clear that restricting this work to just laboratory research does not figure in Washington's plans.

He claimed that the tests of the space antimissile defense system "do not run counter" to the points of the open-ended Soviet-American ABM treaty. Incidentally, such tests, just like the creation and development of such a system, are prohibited by this treaty.

A high-ranking spokesman for the Pentagon stated that the United States "will never go so far" as scrapping all nuclear weapons in Europe. Washington intends to make any accord on medium-range missiles conditional upon the Western deployment in Europe of an additional number of cruise missiles with a shorter radius of operation.

In this connection, THE MORNING STAR notes today that, as what R. Perle says again shows, the United States "continues to strive for strategic superiority" over the Soviet Union.

ARBATOV ON REYKJAVIK, DISARMAMENT FEASIBILITY

PY201449 Buenos Aires CLARIN in Spanish 19 Oct 86 p 2

[Interview granted by Georgiy Arbatov, director of the United States and Canada Institute at the USSR Academy of Sciences, in Reykjavik, to CLARIN "shortly after meeting"]

[Text] Georgiy Arbatov is a top figure in the Kremlin. For the past 20 years he has been the Soviet leaders' consultant on foreign policy, particularly on relations with the United States.

Of all the members of the Soviet delegation to accompany Mikhail Gorbachev to the Reykjavik summit, Arbatov was far and away the man whom the press, particularly U.S. journalists, were most eager to contact.

CLARIN was able to talk with Arbatov for a few minutes shortly after the Reyjavik meeting ended. This is what the Soviet official said.

[CLARIN] You have said that in Reykjavik the USSR presented major proposals of great historical significance. How would you describe them?

[Arbatov] When Gorbachev proposed the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, and left to Ronald Reagan the choice of stages and means to attain mutual control, he demonstrated a sincere intention to find a final solution to the anguishing threat of nuclear war, something that could destroy mankind. This is a "major" proposal of "historical" significance.

[CLARIN] Does that mean that the USSR is willing to agree to a total ban on nuclear weapons and on nuclear tests?

[Arbatov] Yes, without any limitations. This proves our unconditional intention to achieve peace with strict mutual guarantees and without advantage for either side. Our decision to extend the ban on nuclear testing, despite U.S. noncompliance, reveals our goodwill.

[CLARIN] Do you personally believe that it will be possible to implement total disarmament?

[Arbatov] I do, and so do the Soviet government and people. I am sure it is a feasible and necessary step that will curb the senseless arms race that is hindering mankind's progress.

[CLARIN] If the USSR and the United States reach a nuclear disarmament agreement, what will be the role played by other powers that have nuclear bombs or that are developing them?

[Arbatov] The essential point is an agreement between Washington and Moscow. The rest will come by itself. I do not think any other nation will expect to be allowed to enjoy the exclusive right to kill and destroy. This is all very obvious. Several major concessions had to be made to hold this summit, for which the USSR worked very hard. Among such concessions is the decision to temporarily disregard British and French nuclear power.

[CLARIN] Do you believe this summit is significant when many or nearly all Western media consider it a failure?

[Arbatov] During the summit, things were said, proposals made, and agreements reached, although final decisions have been postponed until new talks in Geneva and the next summit, which will be of major importance to the world. When the European governments and peoples realize that during the summit an agreement to make the continent a nuclear free zone was nearly reached, they will all exert pressure to make what the two parties thought feasible a fact. The unsuitability of the star wars is something circumstantial. Such contradiction could not sustain itself for very long.

If there is an agreement to banish atomic weapons, then why should a country jeopardize its whole international sphere of influence with projects that are so dangerous for humanity? Gorbachev is completely right to say that only a crazy man could accept a disarmament proposal while the United States seeks to assemble a still more dangerous military program: the SDI (Strategic Defense Initiative).

Once Ronald Reagan's position is analyzed it will be shown to be unrealistic, because in practice, it means that only the Soviet Union should accept nuclear disarmament and not the United States. What is more, Gorbachev made further concessions: He agreed to allow the Americans to proceed with their Strategic Defense Initiative but only at a laboratory level. As you can see, more than this is not possible.

FALIN ON REYKJAVIK 'INVESTMENT,' NEW INITIATIVE

LD181655 Hamburg DPA in German 1559 GMT 18 Oct 86

[Text] Hamburg, 18 Oct (DPA) -- Valentin Falin, chairman of the Board of the Soviet news agency NOVOSTI and former Soviet ambassador to Bonn, has given an optimistic assessment of the meeting in Reykjavik. In an interview in the latest edition of DER SPIEGEL, the Hamburg newsmagazine, Falin [words indistinct] that Reykjavik was a "long-term investment," which does not yield dividends immediately but nevertheless pays off."

Concerning U.S. President Ronald Reagan, Falin said that for the first time, Reagan had "negotiated in a really businesslike manner." He had shown that he knew how to negotiate constructively if he wanted to.

However, Falin blamed the Americans for continuing to want to bleed the Russians to death by forcing them to arm [totruستن]. He held out the prospect of Soviet counterarmement which "if it came to it, would annihilate SDI (Strategic Defense Initiative)."

Falin thinks it "very probable" that the USSR will come out with a new initiative in a few weeks in order to offer halt to the "senseless arms race." Cooperation between the two superpowers is also necessary on the Near East, Afghanistan, Namibia, and the Gulf War.

CHERNYSHEV: 'REAL PROGRESS' POSSIBLE IN GENEVA

LD210848 Moscow TASS in English 0746 GMT 21 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 21 TASS -- TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev:

The Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons have resumed in Geneva. Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has announced that the Soviet Union is not withdrawing its proposals tabled in Reykjavik. All this has created a qualitatively new situation and a possibility for real progress if the United States at long last reverts to a realistic position.

It would seem that a changed situation calls for a new mode of action. Yet senior officials of the U.S. Administration, contrary to the Soviet Union's statement that its proposals are a package, keep speculating on opportunities to extract from the package only what benefits Washington.

To begin with, clearly to reassure Western Europe, Washington officials claim that there are prospects for a separate agreement on medium-range missiles. Such claims, however, are groundless.

The Geneva talks will be conducted in every area and a separate agreement on each group of weapons can be drawn up. Yet the decision to put them into effect should be all-embracing.

The Soviet Union has every reason to follow this approach. First, Soviet territory, unlike that of the U.S.A., is exposed to a doubled threat, that posed by the American strategic triad, on the one hand, and that created by American medium-range missiles and forward-based systems, on the other. The USSR detached medium-range missiles from the strategic equation but simultaneously proposed a solution on that class of weapons as part of the package. Consenting to radical cuts in its medium-range missile force in Asia and leaving aside for the time being the American forward-based systems, it nevertheless envisions a decision on dismantling all the nuclear weapons of the sides at a subsequent stage.

Second, the Eurostrategic balance of nuclear forces includes the nuclear potentials of Britain and France. Voicing its readiness to leave aside the question of those potentials as well, the USSR believed that the complete elimination of Soviet and American medium-range missiles in Europe would go hand in hand with deep cuts in the strategic nuclear potentials of the USSR and the U.S.A. This linkage is extremely important because the British and French leaders have promised on more than one occasion to join in the process of reducing nuclear armaments at a point when the Soviet Union and the United States have drastically cut their nuclear forces.

III. 21 Oct 86

AA 13

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS
ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Third, as deep cuts in nuclear weapons are made, there is a need for a guarantee that neither side will seek military superiority during that time. The tightening of the ABM treaty should provide such a guarantee.

All this shows that the Soviet Union has a clear idea of the ultimate goal and practical philosophy of disarmament. Regrettably, the United States has not yet embraced either.

KARPOV 17 OCT BRIEFING ON REYKJAVIK CITED

USSR Intentions

PM201431 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Oct 86 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "At the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Press Center"]

[Text] A briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists on the results of the Soviet-American summit meeting in Reykjavik was held on 17 October at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Press Center. Those present were addressed by V.P. Karpov, chief of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Administration for Arms Limitation and Disarmament Problems and head of the Soviet delegation at the Geneva Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons.

He drew the correspondents' attention to the story current in the West according to which the USSR went to the meeting in Reykjavik with proposals which it allegedly knew in advance to be unacceptable to the U.S. President. In other words, they are trying to create the opinion among the public in Western countries that the Soviet Union went to the talks with the intention of ruining them.

Once again reminding journalists of the basic tenets of the Soviet position in Reykjavik, cogently explained by M.S. Gorbachev both at the press conference he gave in the Icelandic capital and in his speech on Soviet television, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman demonstrated the totally unfounded nature of fabrications by the bourgeois mass information media and certain Western politicians who, as he observed, are resorting to these fabrications with the aim of making the Soviet Union to blame for the accords which failed to materialize and sowing mistrust of our country and its foreign policy.

The speaker also noted that the U.S. President -- who has said more than once before that the SDI program is strictly research -- nevertheless refused to sign an accord saying that this research would not go beyond the laboratory for 10 years and that it would be strictly in accord with the ABM Treaty. It was thereby demonstrated that the American Administration's words are at variance with its actions.

The USSR Foreign Ministry administration chief also drew attention to the fact that the proposals put forward by the Soviet Union in Reykjavik represent a comprehensive package. This does not mean that talks will not be conducted on each of the areas already being discussed in Geneva. That is, on the subjects of space weapons, strategic offensive weapons, and medium-range weapons in Europe. A separate agreement can be drawn up on each of these issues. However, the decision to put these agreements into effect must be a comprehensive one, taking into account all the basic elements of the nuclear problem, he stressed.

SDI Obstacle

LD171851 Moscow TASS in English 1823 GMT 17 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 17 TASS -- The Strategic Defense Initiative is in essence the main political obstacle on the road toward achieving the aims of reducing and completely eliminating nuclear weapons, said Viktor Karpov, head of the Department of Arms Limitation and Disarmament at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR.

As it became clear at the talks in Reykjavik, he said, speaking at a press briefing here today, precisely SDI prevented the talks from attaining their aims.

The Soviet side never demanded that the U.S. President renounce SDI: as such, Karpov went on to say.

What is called for, though, was that work under SDI be carried out over a period of 10 years in strict compliance with the existing ABM Treaty. Confining research and development in the SDI sphere to laboratories constitutes a certain guarantee that the strategic situation based on the ABM Treaty would be preserved in that 10-year period, the Foreign Ministry official emphasized.

We believe that the main destabilizing part of SDI is the space ABM system and its components. We, therefore, proposed to ban for 10 years the testing of space ABM elements in outer space -- the factor that creates an obstacle for the deployment of such systems right after the 10 year period expires.

If there are no Soviet offensive arms, including ballistic missiles, then what does the U.S. need the anti-ballistic missile defense for? In this context, President Reagan's pronouncement to the effect that he could not give SDI up because it guaranteed the safety of the "free world" from the Soviet ballistic missiles is becoming groundless. Something is clearly wrong with logic here, Karpov went on to say.

We believe that the agreements concluded in the sphere of nuclear and space arms should be subjected to strict verification, Viktor Karpov said. It is possible to agree those verification measures which may be necessary to give the sides complete confidence that the agreements conclude are complied with, Karpov emphasized.

The American side should get over some misconceptions, Karpov said. What the U.S. lacks at the moment is precisely the determination to do that.

The Foreign Ministry official expressed the hope that the U.S. Administration would analyze the results of the Reykjavik talks in detail, weigh the entire measure of responsibility which rest with the U.S. leadership and pass a decision that will open up the road to nuclear disarmament.

We, for our part, are prepared to negotiate, to work out agreements, relying in the process on what was achieved in Reykjavik, Viktor Karpov emphasized.

OBSERVERS ANALYZE REYKJAVIK MOTIVATIONS

LD170110 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 16 Oct 86

[Discussion entitled "Reykjavik -- An Indispensable Dialogue;" with political observers Aleksandr Yevgenyevich Bovin and Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin; and All-Union Radio commentator Viktor Nikolayevich Levin]

[Text] [Levin] Hello, esteemed comrades! Our broadcast today is devoted to the meeting of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, with U.S. President Ronald Reagan in Reykjavik.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo noted that the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting was an important event in international life, in the struggle against the arms race and for the banning and elimination of nuclear weapons and for the removal of the threat of war from the entire globe. This meeting has provoked a very wide response throughout the entire world. It is being much discussed now and indisputably deserves the closest and most serious attention. But before analyzing this meeting, it is expedient to say a few words about why it was necessary, why the Soviet Union took the initiative of holding an interim meeting.

[Bovin] This meeting was the result of the bad state of Soviet-U.S. relations and the wish of our leadership and Comrade Gorbachev, through the use of nonstandard, I would say, solutions and actions which were not stereotypical, to guide these relations into the channel outlined in Geneva, but which through the Americans' fault has not been filled with the fruitful lifeblood of these relations. And so, Comrade Gorbachev and the Politburo proposed a meeting, an interim meeting, a meeting prior to the meeting! In the practice of international diplomacy, this is an infrequent event: to hold such an impromptu major foreign policy meeting in this way, without preparation. Reagan agreed to it and it was held. This was the genesis of this meeting, if you like.

[Shishlin] In itself the meeting in Reykjavik -- this can be said conclusively -- was exceptionally rich and full of content. Even though, outwardly, it may appear as if the sides did not succeed in coming to an agreement, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that at the meeting in Reykjavik, even though agreement on a number of a number of very serious positions was not managed...

[Bovin, interrupting] There was no final, comprehensive agreement, but in specific areas fairly far-reaching accords were reached. That, to be precise, is how things stand.

[Shishlin] Not only that, there is also the point that Reykjavik has brought out very clearly that two ways of thinking, two different approaches, are clashing: one a modern and really bold one, in line with the realities of the nuclear space age; and another which, as a matter of fact operates in those political categories typical of the start of the 20th century. I have familiarized myself with the speech that President Reagan delivered upon his return from Reykjavik. It is curious that both in the President's speech and prior to that, in the speech of Secretary of State Shultz, it was said that the Americans had come to the meeting with very wide, interesting proposals; almost everything seemed to proceed smoothly; and allegedly the Soviet Union's uncompromising attitude in the matter of the star wars program or the Strategic Defense Initiative, as it is also called, prevented a full-scale accord which would give the green light for a new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, this time a really wide-ranging and comprehensive one.

Here one needs to tell our listeners that this U.S. version of who brought what to the meeting is absolutely incorrect. Indeed, the Soviet Union did not come empty-handed to Reykjavik, and these proposals are known from Mikhail Sergeyevich's address in Reykjavik and on central television. As for the U.S. side, essentially not a single, literally not one independent idea was proposed by them.

Yes, the Americans said they wanted a full-scale summit. Yes, they said they were willing to stage this meeting in Washington. They did say those things. But on specific questions, be it strategic offensive armaments, medium-range nuclear weapons, the halting of nuclear tests, the strengthening of the ABM Treaty, on all these questions the Americans were only prepared to say the same old things, restating, setting out, and repeating their old positions. It really took an immense effort to get both the U.S. President and the persons accompanying him, to persuade them, to start discussing the essence of the Soviet ideas.

[Bovin] Let us pinpoint the positive aspects of this meeting; after all it is interesting. Incidentally, regardless of what happened in Reykjavik itself, these positive results will endure. Let us take the first set of questions, strategic armaments. Our idea, a framework idea, so to speak, was as follows: Launch vehicles and warheads would be cut by 50 percent. In the past, arguments have always been caused by the fact that the different elements making up our and U.S. weapons are not at all uniform. We have more of one thing and they have more of another. So we proposed the simplest solution, suggesting that each element of the triad be cut in half. Let us cut planes by 50 percent. Let us cut land-based missiles by 50 percent. The same for submarines. Let us cut each element by 50 percent. Diversity would be maintained, but even so everything would be cut by 50 percent.

[Shishlin] Yes, there would be fewer armaments but more security.

[Bovin] It was so elementary that after that all-night session on Saturday even Paul Nitze was compelled to agree with this. The Americans did agree to this. That was the first set of questions, so to speak. Now let us look at the second set of questions.

[Shishlin] Medium-range nuclear armaments.

[Bovin] Yes, intermediate ones.

[Shishlin] As you know, the Soviet Union put forward the idea, a new idea for Europe, of scrapping Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe and then...

[Bovin interrupts] Well, Gorbachev said quite forthrightly that we were accepting the zero option which the Americans proposed some time back. We were accepting it. We told the Americans this.

[Shishlin] Yes, but there were two, even three points the Americans were bothered about, which made them say that it was difficult to reach agreement. They were left on one side. We decided not to concern ourselves with these, but to confine ourselves to Soviet-U.S. relations. The Americans went on to say: Let's take a half step forward first, in other words limit the Soviet and U.S. armaments in Europe first.

[Bovin] They were playing tricks the whole time. The Americans are terribly anxious not to withdraw their missiles from Europe. That's what they don't want to do. We'll take out half or a quarter, but let us keep something in Europe, they were saying.

[Shishlin] Yes. Then they said that this decision could only be viewed in a global context. In other words, the corresponding medium-range nuclear armaments stationed in the Asian part of the country had to be included. Eventually the Soviet delegation in Reykjavik put forward the idea that we should keep 100 warheads on armaments of this type in the Asian part of the country, while 100 warheads on the corresponding armaments, armaments of the same class, would be retained on U.S. territory.

[Bovin] In point of fact this was a big concession to the Americans. Then there was also the question of short-range missiles.

[Shishlin] Tactical ones.

[Bovin] Yes.

[Shishlin] Yes. There the proposal was that they should be frozen, quite simply...

[Bovin interrupts] ...and that talks should be started.

[Shishlin] Yes. Here too the Americans eventually accepted this option. Next there was the question of nuclear testing.

[Bovin interrupts] Monitoring. They kept sounding off about monitoring. At this point we said to them: You can have any form of monitoring you want. You can even have triple monitoring, Gorbachev said. We are prepared to discuss and accept any form of monitoring just as long as it meets the requirements of what we are talking about. So, the matter was resolved. There's no problem over monitoring now.

[Shishlin] Now what about nuclear tests? Well, our listeners all know very well that the Soviet Union has extended its unilateral moratorium for the forth time. The Soviet Union has not been carrying out nuclear tests for 14 months now. What the Americans say -- in fact, none other than U.S. Secretary of State Shultz -- is this: When the Soviet Union advocates the cessation of nuclear tests, the Soviet Union is putting the cart before the horse, that you first have to eliminate nuclear weapons, and then to stop testing. [passage indistinct]

[Bovin] Imagine -- why have testing at all, there will be no grounds.

[Shishlin] Clearly, there will be nothing to test.

[Levin] But when they want to take the decision, they will find problems. In this case, Shultz has evidently come up with this kind of problem.

[Shishlin] But all in all the Americans have been given to understand, and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said at the press conference in Reykjavik, that there too, the outlines of a possible accord were examined.

[Levin] We went a long way there. We agreed: Fine, you do not want to follow our example of the moratorium; all right, you want to set up some kind of quota for tests, some kind of threshold for [passage indistinct].

[Bovin] In fact, when you speak of the positive aspect of Reykjavik, there is a very great deal that is positive. One big plus is the radical accords that overall move a long way in comparison with what there was before.

[Shishlin] It has to be noted that Reykjavik is a qualitatively new point in Soviet-U.S. relations and a qualitatively new point in respect of the resolution of all problems related to the limitation and curtailment of the arms race. Everything that came before Reykjavik concerned only the limitation of weapons, but here we were talking about radical, profound reductions.

[Levin] In virtually all aspects of nuclear weapons.

[Bovin] I would like to be more precise: In our view this 50 percent reduction should take 5 years, and the next 5 years, all in all, should take it to zero. The Americans agreed to this decade: that is, in 10 years we eliminate nuclear weapons. That is how deep it went.

[Levin] I think that one can say that all of our proposals -- and one must not forget this -- that were accepted by the United States have made up the walls from which the building of a lasting peace could be put together. It remains to top them off with a reliable roof. We -- the Soviet Union -- reason like this: Once we enter a completely new situation, when a considerable reduction of nuclear weapons and their elimination over a visibly short period is starting, it is necessary to safeguard oneself against all surprises. We are talking about weapons that up to now constitute the core of the defense of our country -- I mean strategic weapons. Therefore, everything that could undermine equality in the course of disarmament has to be excluded; any possibility of developing [sozdat] weapons of a new type which secure military superiority must be excluded. We consider this position to be perfectly natural and logical, and so the Soviet Union firmly stated the need for the strict observance of the 1972 open-ended AMB Treaty. Moreover, in order to strengthen the conditions of that treaty, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, proposed to U.S. President Ronald Reagan at the Reykjavik meeting that reciprocal obligations be undertaken on the part of the United States and the Soviet Union not to exercise the right of withdrawal from the treaty for at least 10 years, and over that period to put an end to strategic weapons.

In this respect, we are proceeding from the fact that there will be complete observance of all the clauses of the ABM Treaty: in other words, that research [issledovaniye] and testing in the field covered by the treaty does not go outside the laboratory. That is an identical restriction, both on the United States and on the USSR.

It is here, unfortunately, that we have to say that the agreement that had virtually been achieved could not be embodied in accords binding on the sides, for the sole reason consisting of the stubborn reluctance of the U.S. Administration to create the conditions for the implementation of these accords by means of strengthening the ABM terms and undertaking relevant obligations identical for both sides.

[Shishlin] It is the SDI that is in fact, the main idol on Washington's political altar. They pray to it -- that's a favorite topic for the White House and the White House entourage. As before, they continued to say, that allegedly, why should SDI be restricted in any way at all, that as soon as they get the full complement of all these results they will share their technology with the Soviet Union, although actually the United States is refusing to sell us even washing machines, being of the opinion that electronics beyond our technical thinking are included here.

So, therefore this is a fairy tale -- and it was said perfectly correctly by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary at the press conference, that one simply cannot take this seriously.

[Identity of speaker unclear] No, one cannot. There is a gap in the logic of the U.S. position. We are moving toward the reduction of weapons. We have in view, as Aleksandr Yevgeniyevich has said, essentially a 100 percent reduction, that is, the elimination of this weapon as a class. At the same time, the Americans are saying: We will develop a shield against these weapons which are being eliminated. Why? one asks oneself.

[Bovin] Well, they have, it is true, a safety net. If suddenly some madman makes this missile and suddenly fires it -- well, that's funny because it is hardly worth building a system worth trillions, with hundreds of space stations up there, to counter this theoretically possible eventuality. Surely there must be other simpler options.

[Levin] Immeasurably simpler. In his address on U.S. television Reagan named four arguments in favor of SDI, in his view. He said that SDI is America's insurance policy, which should always guarantee us stability. The second thesis is that it is a guarantee of America's security. It is also the key to a world without nuclear weapons. Yet another argument, and I quote the U.S. President: SDI he says, has forced the Soviets to come to the Geneva talks on arms control, and this is what brought them to Iceland. That is, SDI is a cudgel with which they are driving us to the disarmament talks.

This thesis, to be blunt, is false on two counts: First, the policy of pressure is visible in it; second, it is an obvious attempt to present U.S. policy as constructive, and the Soviet one as unconstructive. The peace-loving nature of our policy is proven simply by the proposals submitted in Reykjavik, and they are so clearly expressed that there is probably no need for any more evidence here. As for U.S. pressure and their reliance on force, this is a calculation that has often been refuted by life and which, and if it comes to it, will be refuted again. The essence of this is that we do not want to play power games. It is not because we are weak that we do not want to, as the United States tries to convince itself. Perhaps someone is relying on that utterly erroneous view, but we understand the danger of these power games in the nuclear missile age. A sense of responsibility to our own people and to the peoples of the whole world dictates to us a completely different approach. This is what creates the need for a new way of thinking in accordance with the nuclear age.

[Bovin] Well, In Reykjavik I got to hear from my fellow correspondents. They were saying this: well, fine, as you wrote in your book, and others on your side are saying all the time that you are not afraid of SDI -- first, it cannot exist, second, we are not afraid -- if it cannot exist and if you are not afraid of it, why do you keep badgering those poor Americans, why are you at their throat?

There is a logic here, and it is also interesting to respond to it, because I tell them, yes, we are not afraid of SDI because we know that if the Americans start to do this, we will find countermeasures. However, we do not want to take these countermeasures, we simply want to reach agreement on the reduction of weapons, and not to spend money on those counter-measures meant to paralyze the SDI.

That's if you're speaking about the military-strategic part of this business, but what if you're talking politically? Then, if on the one hand we start to reduce something, and the Americans have already put their systems into space, then there's mistrust and suspicion. All this starts to grow, because God knows how this weapon in space could be used, and its task might be one of offense.

[Shishlin] Yes, but there is a third element here in all of this. We do not have the right to deny that, let's say, work on this new, very new, super-new, sophisticated technology will allow access to the development of so-called post nuclear weaponry, making use of new discoveries and new opportunities in physics. One could name many such ideas which are, by and large, doing the rounds of U.S. laboratories. Not to allow the start of a new spiral in the arms race, which is extremely destabilizing for the whole situation -- that is also the third argument against SDI.

[Levin] I think this may even be the most important argument, ultimately. If we are setting ourselves the task of scrapping nuclear weapons in order to make the world safe for mankind and to guarantee mankind a future, the creation of still more terrible weapons will certainly not do so. It would virtually be a case of out of the frying pan and into the fire for us. So, without question one can quite definitely draw the conclusion that SDI, which the U.S. military-industrial complex is so excited about and which the present U.S. Administration is also, is an element that is extremely dangerous for peace in general. It is extremely dangerous. That is why our position, our firm position on this question will indisputable be judged on its merits by people throughout the world. There is no doubt about that.

Many people are now beginning to think about this. I noticed that on the first day after the meeting on Monday, the first reaction, the dominant mood in the press was one of, well, disappointment. They'd been climbing and climbing, so the feeling was. They've established a base camp. They mounted their summit bid. They got to within a couple of meters of the summit, but they could not make it to the top. So there was annoyance, disappointment, a feeling that things had gone wrong. But when people started looking more closely at these materials, got a better idea of what the Soviet Union had proposed, of how the Americans had conducted themselves, in the final analysis...[Levin changes thought] After all, if an accord is to be achieved, the other side also has to move closer on specific questions.

[Shishlin] Yes. Now is the time to return to the external factors of the outside world, against the background of which this is difficult -- in some ways even tough -- Soviet-U.S. dialogue in Reykjavik took place. I think that these external factors will increase in strength and exert a growing influence. In this regard I have in mind the position of the socialist countries, which actively advocate an amelioration of international relations and radical steps aimed at reducing and cutting back the arms race. I have in mind the position of the Nonaligned Movement, which was set out quite clearly and authoritatively at the Harare conference. I have in mind the position of...

[Bovin interrupts] U.S. Allies, of course.

[Shishlin] The U.S. allies.

[Levin] FRG Chancellor Kohl, Defense Minister Woerner, and Foreign Minister Genscher are to visit Washington this week. I noticed that in general, all the reports that have come in from Bonn indicate a kind of wariness, a quite overt wariness toward the U.S. position. I would even go so far as to say that there is dissatisfaction, poorly concealed, or rather not very carefully disguised dissatisfaction with the position taken by the United States.

[Shishlin] There's another point, Viktor Nikolayevich. The Soviet proposals take very full account of the interests of European states, and not only European states. To clear the mines from the European Continent, to rid it of the most dangerous weapons...

[Bovin interrupts] ...would be a real step.

[Shishlin] Yes.

[Bovin] A real step.

[Shishlin] A great achievement.

[Bovin] The removal of Euromissiles and subsequent agreement on tactical missiles was discussed at Reykjavik. It is all in the interests of both Eastern and Western Europe. There can be no other view about this. Surely, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's proposal on medium-range nuclear missiles in Asia, not just the Asian part of our country but also those at U.S. bases, is in the interests of our Asian neighbors.

[Bovin] But returning to Reykjavik again, we are all asking ourselves what actually happened. Why didn't the Americans move to accept these seemingly simple things? This is where the lack of new political thinking mentioned by Mikhail Sergeyevich comes in. What does this mean? It simply means the inertia of old ideas. It means the military-industrial complex, which is exerting heavy pressure, because it's not just ideas. Billions of dollars are at stake. It means the old, imperial ideology associated with anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism and the idea that the United States is biggest and best, the most important, top dog in fact -- the idea that everybody must do as the Americans do.

[Bovin] This is extremely deep-seated among the Americans: It was this that made itself felt. For the moment, these latent influences got the upper hand.

[Shishlin] We shall talk a bit now about the other problems that were discussed in Reykjavik, in particular, regional conflicts and the sides' approach to settling regional conflicts, and about the discussions which developed on humanitarian issues. It must be said that even here, even given all the difference in the Soviet and U.S. positions, some points of contact were nevertheless felt and took shape, both on humanitarian problems and on regional conflicts.

All this was to a certain degree pushed aside by the Americans' nonagreement on the main priority issue, that of curtailing the arms race.

[Bovin] It's even more narrow than that -- it's the issue of the star wars program. I think from a certain point of view what happened is useful for the enlightenment of world public opinion, for the emperor has turned out to have no clothes on. In the final analysis, it has turned out that it has all happened because the Americans do not want to give up this idea of theirs.

[Shishlin] Aleksandr Yevgenyevich, I would like to mention an interesting detail from Reykjavik. You remember on 12 October, the U.S. services, and official ones, at that -- Speakes, the White House spokesman, started to accuse the Soviet experts of breaking the confidentiality of the talks and starting leaks, by giving interviews. In fact, there were no leaks: our comrades simply expounded the positions which had been openly declared by the Soviet Union. The Americans were frightfully displeased at this. Why? Because a direct comparison of the positions really does reveal a fact unfavorable for the Americans, namely that the emperor has no clothes on. No matter how much they say that they brought bold and diverse ideas to Reykjavik, they arrived with empty baggage.

[Levin] Well, let's sum up. We have firmly elucidated that the meeting in Reykjavik was necessary. This clearly derived from the whole atmosphere preceeding Reykjavik and from the way that Soviet-U.S. relations developed after Geneva. The question at the center of attention now is the Reykjavik meeting itself: Was it of use or not? There is a precise answer to that question. The CPSU Central Committee Politburo points out that a qualitatively new situation has been created: the struggle for nuclear disarmament has reached a higher level, from which today it is necessary to increase efforts further aimed at making a radical reduction in and at wholly eliminating nuclear weapons. In this connection, stress was laid upon the need to continue contacts and negotiations, including those in Geneva, on the whole complex of issues relating to nuclear and space weapons, on the basis of the platform put forward by the Soviet side in Reykjavik.

I would like to draw your attention, esteemed comrades, in particular to the following words set out in the document on the CPSU Central Committee Politburo session: It would be a fateful step to let slip this historic opportunity for a fundamental solution to the problems of war and peace. Everything possible must be done to make use of this opportunity.

Therefore, to summarize, we can with complete justification say that the meeting was important, interesting and indisputably useful, holding out great promise. On that note we shall close for today. Thank you, esteemed comrades, for your attention.

U.S. CONTINUES REYKJAVIK 'PROPAGANDA' CAMPAIGN

Reagan Grand Forks Speech

PM201437 Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Oct 86 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Trying To Distort"]

[Text] Washington, 18 Oct -- The U.S. Administration is continuing a massive propaganda campaign to foist on the world public its own interpretation distorting the results of the Soviet-American summit in Reykjavik.

Speaking in Grand Forks (North Dakota), President R. Reagan maintained that the meeting "marked a real move in our talks with the Soviet Union." At the same time he bluntly declared that "the only way to hold talks about peace is to do so from a position of strength." The administration head made another attempt to justify the U.S. Administration's refusal to limit the implementation of the outlined "star wars" plans. He gave an assurance that "SDI is a purely defensive, peaceful technology."

Distortion of Soviet ABM Stance

FM171710 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Oct 86 First Edition p 4

[K. Georgiyev article: "Contrary to Facts and Logic"]

[Text] At the 12 October press conference in Reykjavik and in his 14 October Soviet television speech M. S. Gorbachev reproduced a photographically accurate and clear picture of how his meeting with U.S. President R. Reagan proceeded and how it ended.

The whole world received an accurate and clear idea of how, thanks to the Soviet side's persistence and, to be blunt, boldness the top leaders of the USSR and the United States came close to reaching an understanding on radically reducing and then totally eliminating nuclear arms -- both strategic and medium-range. It was equally clearly demonstrated why, through whose fault, this "breathtaking" prospect, in the felicitous expression of one Western figure, remained for the time being a potentiality and did not assume the form of an accord binding upon the sides.

You would think everything was clear to everyone. Nonetheless, high-ranking representatives of the U.S. Administration, including the secretary of state and the President's assistant for national security affairs, are continuing to persist in attempts to distort the true state of affairs.

Not denying the positive elements achieved at the Reykjavik meeting (moreover, actually attempting to take the main credit for them), the President and his spokesmen are doing their utmost to persuade the world that the obstacle to everything in Reykjavik was the Soviet side's demand for changes in the ABM Treaty, which in its present form allegedly does not prevent implementation of the American SDI program right up to the start of the deployment of the space ABM means created within the framework of that program.

In an attempt to prove the supposed invalidity of the Soviet side's formulation of the question of not carrying out research into such means outside the laboratory, Secretary of State G. Shultz, for instance, openly stated: "The Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems makes no mention of this, so this would definitely be a change in it."

Is that claim consonant with the facts? Let us look at the facts -- that is always the most reliable way of establishing the truth.

Here is what Article V of the AMB Treaty says: "Each party undertakes not to develop [sozdavat], test, or deploy ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air-based, space-based, or mobile land-based."

As we can see, this speaks unambiguously of a pledge by the sides not only not to deploy but also not to test space-based ABM means. So you can only claim the opposite if you are counting on uninformed people, but is it permissible for statesmen to behave in this way?

In an attempt to confuse this extremely clear issue, people in Washington sometimes cite one of the agreed statements appended to the treaty; this statement allows of the possibility of the sides acquiring ABM means based on physical principles other than those which existed at the time the treaty was signed. Since, so they claim, it is precisely fundamentally new ABM means such as lasers, directed energy weapons, and so forth that are being developed [razrabotka] under the SDI program, the development [razrabotka] and testing of such means, including in space, do not fall under Article V of the treaty.

However, again counting on uninformed people, they fail to mention that the possibility of the appearance of such "exotic" means as replacements for those that previously existed is admitted by the statement in question only with regard to the limited ABM areas authorized by Article III of the treaty and only with regard to stationary land systems. In other words, it has no relevance whatever to Article V of the treaty, which prohibits space-based ABM means.

The text of both the treaty itself and of the appendices to it admit of no other interpretation. That is not simply the Soviet side's opinion. The official report of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency submitted to Congress 31 January 1983 -- that is, under the present administration -- states in black and white that the treaty's ban on the development [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment of space-based ABM systems or components for such systems "applies also to directed energy technology or any other technology utilized for this purpose."

It could not be put more clearly. As we can see, there were no divergences between the USSR and U.S. positions on this issue until on 23 March 1983, that is, 6 weeks after the aforementioned report, President R. Reagan announced the "strategic defense initiative." Then all of a sudden Washington began to portray "chalk as cheese." It is continuing to engage in this unsavory venture to this day.

Thus it is a matter of a desire on the part of the American side, and certainly not the Soviet side, to change, or to be more accurate, destroy the ABM Treaty. The Soviet Union is merely insisting on strict compliance with all provisions of the treaty.

That this is precisely the case is also proved by the fact that in Reykjavik the American side openly proposed replacing (and not merely changing) the ABM Treaty with some other treaty that would regulate the procedure for developing [sozdaniye] space ABM systems -- no less!

In this connection it is natural to ask the following question: Why did the President find it necessary to produce a proposal for replacing the ABM Treaty (a point which people in Washington now prefer not to mention, incidentally) if the SDI program really does fit in with the present treaty, as they endeavor to prove?

Washington is clearly at odds both with the fact and with logic.

SHEVARDNADZE, U.S. ENVOY DISCUSS TIES, REYKJAVIK

LD201951 Moscow TASS in English 1845 GMT 20 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 20 TASS -- Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, received today Arthur Hartman, U.S. ambassador to the USSR, at his request. The sides exchanged views on a number of questions connected with bilateral Soviet-American relations, including those that had been discussed in the course of the summit meeting in Reykjavik.

CONGRESS DROPS ARMS CONTROL CLAUSES, ADJOURNS

LD190925 Moscow TASS in English 0725 GMT 19 Oct 86

[Text] Washington October 19 TASS -- The session of the 99th U.S. Congress is over.

Despite all the efforts by the senators and congressmen to wind up the debates as soon as possible and to go to their districts where electioneering is now in full progress on the eve of the November 4 elections, the session was two weeks longer than planned.

Protracted fierce debates both inside Congress and between the law-makers and the White House over the problems under discussion and, first of all, over the question of the U.S. budget for the 1987 fiscal year, were the main cause of the prolongation of the session.

The new budget envisages the allocation of 291,800 million dollars as military expenditures.

Under the pressure of the White House, the Congress excluded the amendments which had been earlier introduced to the law on the budget by the House of Representatives.

The amendments had stipulated that the SALT-2 Treaty limits on strategic arms should be observed, that nuclear tests with a yield of over one kiloton in the Nevada desert should be suspended for a year, and that the allocation of any funds to the Department of Defence for the production of binary rounds should be banned for a year.

U.S. SATELLITES PHOTOGRAPH OBJECTS IN C. ASIA

LD181054 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in German 2030 GMT 18 Oct 86

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] In the United States it has become a kind of written rule to justify in advance its own military preparations by references to a Soviet arms buildup. This has been the case several times in the past, and something similar is happening now, when across the ocean they have started work on the SDI, which envisages the creation and development of offensive space weapons.

In this connection, an article in the U.S. magazine AVIATION WEEK & SPACE TECHNOLOGY is indicative. It reports, among other things, that a U.S. Air Force spy satellite has photographed two new objects in Soviet Central Asia. The magazine maintains that these objects have been constructed on the basis of the most modern technology.

Well, what is unusual about that, one might ask? There are thousands of new construction sites in the Soviet Union, including those based on the most modern technology. These include factories, housing blocks, sanatoria, convalescent homes and the like. Why, then, have these two in particular attracted the attention of the United States? First, because, as the magazine writes, they are huge; and second, they are situated on mountain tops. This is sufficient to draw a significant conclusion -- that this is allegedly nothing other than perhaps an operational antisatellite laser system. In other words, the Soviet Union already possesses what the creators of SDI are wracking their brains over.

Although this justification is quite (?stupid), the magazine accuses the Soviet Union in all seriousness of violating the ABM Treaty by creating antimissile systems and new control centers. One is involuntarily reminded of a similar story of recent vintage. In the region of Krasnoyarsk in Siberia a Soviet radio direction finding station is under construction. What have they not said about this in the West? Invented reasons were cited, claiming that this station was intended as a missile early-warning system against missile attack. In fact, it was all much more simple. The station has no relation to an early-warning system of missile attack. This was officially communicated to the U.S. side. The Krasnoyarsk station is intended for the observation of space objects and for the continuation of the extensive program of peaceful use of space. After this Washington was compelled to tone down its false accusations against the USSR for a time, but the need to justify its own policy of preparing for star wars remained.

Broad sections of progressive public opinion are speaking out increasingly strongly against the policy of the Reagan administration, and that is why new, or better to say renewed, fabrications on an old theme have begun. It is this relevant to state that the U.S. intelligence authorities have refrained from an assessment. The intelligence authorities are not decided, and the magazine -- more precisely, those behind it -- have already cobbled together appropriate conclusions. Immediately after this, the management of the SDI project stated hurriedly: Whatever the objects photographed by the satellites were, they bore no relation to any U.S. laser weapon objects. Consequently, such objects really exist in the United States. In connection with this, the question arises: Who, then, is infringing upon the ABM treaty?

IZVESTIYA REPORTS BATMONH-ROGACHEV TALKS

PM200949 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Oct 86 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "In a Spirit of Friendship"]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, 15 Oct -- J. Batmonh, general secretary of the MPRP Central Committee and chairman of the Presidium of the Mongolian People's Great Hural, today received I.A. Rogachev, USSR deputy foreign minister.

The Mongolian leader was given a detailed report on the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit in Reykjavik.

J. Batmonh stated that the Mongolian people fully support the principled stance taken by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the talks with the U.S. President. The bold, far-reaching proposals put forward by the Soviet side at that meeting are an example of new thinking and confirmation of the sincerity of the Soviet Union's desire to rid the world of the threat of nuclear war. He stressed that all the peoples, their governments, and all peace-loving forces should now broaden still further the struggle to ensure that the historic opportunity offered by the USSR of achieving a decisive breakthrough in nuclear disarmament is not lost.

Questions of Soviet-Mongolian cooperation and some problems of international life were also discussed during the conversation, which took place in a spirit of friendship and complete mutual understanding.

Present at the conversation were T. Namsray, member of the Politburo and secretary of the MPRP Central Committee; T. Balhajib, secretary of the MPRP Central Committee; and K. Ye. Fomichenko, USSR ambassador to Mongolia.

MONGOLIA'S DUGERSUREN MAKES MOSCOW STOPOVER

PM200953 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Oct 86 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] Mongolian Foreign Minister M. Dugersuren passed through Moscow 14-15 October on his way home after participating in the 41st General Assembly Session.

ARISTOV DISCUSSED TRADE WITH JAPANESE OFFICIAL

PM200947 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Oct 86 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] Foreign Trade Minister B.I. Aristov had talks at the Foreign Trade Ministry 15 October with K. Murata, the Japanese Government's special representative, who is in the USSR in connection with the holding of the "Japan-86" Trade and Industry Exhibition.

Questions of activating bilateral relations in the trade and economic spheres were discussed.

TASS ON 'NEW STAGE' IN SOVIET-JAPANESE RELATIONS

LD191042 Moscow TASS in English 0951 GMT 19 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 19 TASS -- TASS commentator Aleksandr Nulov writes:

Thirty years ago, on October 19, 1956, a new stage was started in the history of post-war Soviet-Japanese relations: a joint Soviet-Japanese declaration was signed in Moscow which proclaimed the termination of the state of war and the restoration of diplomatic and consular relations between the two countries. Recorded in the declarations were some basic principles of the future Soviet-Japanese relations and agreements on a number of major practical issues.

However, since that time the way of the development of Soviet-Japanese relations has been far from straight. The advance which, on the whole was typical of it in the first two decades gave way to the freezing of the relations, and not through the fault of the Soviet side. Under the pressure of the domestic and mostly outside forces which are not friendly towards the Soviet Union Japan actively joined the campaign of 'sanctions' against the USSR and deliberately limited contacts with it. All this led to the worsening of Soviet-Japanese relations in late 70s and early 80s.

As a result of the active stand of the Soviet Union and certain changes in the approach of the Japanese Government, some indications of the turn for the better in relations between the two countries appeared in the past several years. Contracts that were broken off were resumed, reciprocal visits to the USSR and Japan of statesmen, party and public figures of the two countries became more frequent.

This year's exchange of visits of the foreign ministers of the two countries which permitted to put on a regular basis a dialogue held on a high political level became an important event in Soviet-Japanese relations. During the visits agreements were signed which supplemented the treaty and legal basis of the bilateral relations and expanded the basis of cooperation. The pace of the development of bilateral relations in practical spheres became more even.

These positive factors permitted to raise the question of the exchange of visits on the summit level. On the whole, a kind of new stage was started in the Soviet-Japanese relations.

Of course, there are a lot of differences between the two countries in the attitudes and approaches to many international problems and questions connected with bilateral relations. The Soviet Union cannot fail to see the negative features in the foreign and domestic policy of Japan, especially the steady process of the drawing of that country into the U.S. military-strategic plans.

And still, in its policy with regard to Japan the Soviet side proceeds from the assumption that the objective geographic and economic factors and the basic interests of the two neighbouring countries require the establishment of normal or, still better, good neighbourly relations of mutually advantageous cooperation. It is even more so, since historic experience has proved that the development of bilateral relations between the two countries has always done good to the Soviet and Japanese peoples and has made a positive impact on the international situation in the Far East and in Asia in general.

BORODIN VIEWS U.S.-JAPAN 'PROVOCATIVE' MANEUVERS

LD200430 Moscow TASS in International Service in Russian 1051 GMT 19 Oct 86

[Text] Tokyo: 19 Oct -- TASS correspondent Vladimir Borodin reports:

The dust has not yet settled on the training sites of the island of Hokkaido after the recent maneuvers, and once again about 15,000 Japanese and U.S. soldiers have been moved into the region of Shitose base of the Japanese Air Force. They have joined in the first exercises in history by the armed forces of the two countries involving all services, exercises which have begun here. Apart from the sub-units of the ground forces, vessels of the U.S. 7th Fleet of the Japanese naval forces are taking part in them, together with more than 100 combat aircraft, including 50 F-15 fighters, stationed at the Pentagon's airbases in Japan and the Philippines. Until 1 November they will be developing interaction during the holding of military operations in the region of the islands of Hokkaido and Honshu.

The command of the Japanese Armed Forces does not conceal that in its scale the present games can be compared only with the annual provocative U.S.-South Korean "Team Spirit" maneuvers. Apart from working out actions for the destruction of the forces of a conventional opponent who, allegedly, "has invaded Hokkaido and controls all the strategically important points on the island," the U.S. and Japanese units will play out a "scenario of defense" of the main Japanese island. An essential difference between the present exercises and all previous ones lies in the fact that this time the U.S. Armed Forces, at the request of Japan, are engaging in the military actions on an equal footing, and not as the senior partner.

The military maneuvers, which are following one after another on Japanese territory, are giving rise to growing concern among the country's public. The local press has repeatedly pointed out that the notorious plans for "joint defense", which have already entered the stage of practical development, increase immeasurably the threat of Tokyo's being drawn into preparations by Washington for war in the Far East. Also provocative is the fact they are taking place in close proximity to the Soviet Union, which leaves no doubts about their provocative nature.

MOSCOW COMMENTATOR VIKTOROV ON TIES WITH DPRK

SK151232 Moscow International Service in Korean 1130 GMT 14 Oct 86

[Station commentator Viktorov commentary: "Strengthening Cooperation Between the Soviet Union and the DPRK"]

[Text] Strengthening cooperation among socialist countries, the active economic development of these countries, and strengthening relations among these countries are some of the characteristics of the lives of these countries. The DPRK occupies an important place in Soviet relations with the socialist countries. The Soviet Union is in firm relations of friendship and cooperation with the People's Korea. Our country knows that the Korean workers, under the tested leadership of the Workers Party of Korea [WPK], have brought about great achievements in building and strengthening the material and technological foundation of socialism, developing science and culture, and promoting the welfare of the people.

Soviet-Korean friendship has its own history and tradition. The relations between our two countries have been particularly expanded and deepened since the visit to the Soviet Union in May 1984 by a DPRK party and state delegation headed by Comrade Kim Il-song, general secretary of the WPK Central Committee and DPRK president, and subsequent regular meetings between leaders of our two parties in Pyongyang. The fraternal mutual relations are truly broad-based ones. These relations are clearly shown in the economic sector, in particular. For example, with Soviet assistance, some 60 big industrial enterprises have been built or rebuilt in the DPRK. These enterprises produce 28 percent of the total steel production, 29 percent of the total production of rolled steel and ferrous metal, and almost 50 percent of the total production of petroleum products.

The power industry of the DPRK has become important in efficient cooperation. The Pukchang thermal power stations, a big power supply of the country that has the electricity generating capacity of 1.2 million kw, and the Pyongyang, Chongjin, and Unggi power stations have been built with the technological assistance of our country. These power stations produce almost one-third of the total electricity production of the Republic. The plan for economic cooperation between the two countries includes the construction of the first nuclear power station in the Republic and of a thermal power station in the capital of the republic.

As is pointed out by the Korean friends, Soviet-made facilities supplied are reliable and quality goods and are convenient to use. The Soviet technicians, who build new enterprises in the DPRK and who help the Korean workers learn new technology, enjoy deep respect.

Our cooperation is of a reciprocal nature. The Soviet Union imports from the People's Korea goods necessary for the economy of the country, including magnesia clinker, rolled ferrous and nonferrous metal products, car batteries, the people's consumer goods, fruits, and vegetables. The supply of goods based upon the principle of [word indistinct] products, a new form of cooperation that has already proven effective, is being further developed with the passage of time. The plan to strengthen economic relations includes a form of cooperation by which the Korean [choson] industrial sector builds [word indistinct] ships according to the Soviet technological documents and supplies them to the Soviet Union. It is also planned to further develop scientific and technological cooperation and to probe for a new, more complete form of cooperation in order to resolve problems facing the people's economies of the Soviet Union and the DPRK and in order to more widely carry out a series of joint research projects in the scientific and technological field.

The workers of the People's Korea are making their land new, while building socialism. The Soviet people and all friends of the DPRK sincerely rejoice over achievements attained by the fraternal people under the leadership of the WPK.

This year is a special year. The Republic's Second 7-Year Plan to develop the people's economy is being completed this year. Further consolidating the socialist economic system and improving the standard of living for the residents is a basic task of this plan. All of this can be realized only on the condition of peace on the Korean peninsula.

The peaceful creative (?work) of the DPRK people and freedom and (?independence) for it are reliably guaranteed by the Treaty for Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance between the Soviet Union and the DPRK. Celebrations were widely held in our two countries this year to mark the 25th anniversary of the signing of this treaty. This treaty includes a chapter that reads that the two countries shall join efforts to strengthen their power for national defense, to deter the aggression of imperialism, and to maintain and consolidate peace on the Korean peninsula.

Socialism is being built in Korea under complex circumstances. Korea has been divided into two for more than 40 years. The presence of U.S. forces in South Korea was, and is, a major obstacle to peace in Korea. The DPRK Government and social circles have constantly made stubborn efforts to peacefully and democratically reunify the South and the North. The proposal of the DPRK for turning the Korean peninsula into a nonnuclear zone is of great significance. The Soviet peoples support and favor are on the side of the just struggle of the Korean people.

The relations between the Soviet Union and Korea have become [word indistinct] among the fraternal socialist countries. The Soviet Union highly treasures the support of the DPRK side for the Soviet proposal for having Asia and the Pacific be included in the process of establishing a comprehensive international security system.

Recent events show that the friendship and cooperation between the two countries will develop in the future for the welfare of our peoples and the world's socialism in conformity with the cause of joint struggle to oppose the imperialist force and to promote peace and security in Asia.

LATE REPORT: KAPITSA BRIEFS TOKYO ON REYKJAVIK

LD211324 Moscow TASS in English 1318 GMT 21 Oct 86

[Text] Tokyo October 21 TASS -- Mikhail Kapitsa, a special envoy of the Soviet Government and a deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, and the Soviet Union's ambassador to Japan, Nikolay Solovov, today had a meeting with Japan's Foreign Minister Tadashi Kuranari and presented the Soviet view of the Soviet-American summit meeting in Reykjavik.

The Soviet officials stressed that the Soviet Union had laid emphasis at the Iceland meeting on the key problems of international politics, such as the termination of the arms race and nuclear disarmament. It put on the negotiating table a package of major measures which, if they had been accepted, would usher in a new age, an age without nuclear weapons, in human history.

DEPARTING ANTI-AIRCRAFT UNIT LAUDED AT KABUL FETE

LD201052 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 19 Oct 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast; report by special correspondents M. Leshchinskiy and F. Seyful-Mulyakov from Kabul]

[Text] [Leshchinskiy] Today's ceremony to see off a Soviet antiaircraft regiment on its way home took place in a historic location, under the walls of the ancient Bala Hesar Fortress. For 7 years this place has been the temporary garrison for the Soviet anti aircraft gunners. The fortress itself has a great and glorious history that has been written into the pages of the chronicles of the Afghan people's struggle for their freedom and independence. In our time soviet servicemen, too, have helped defend the freedom of Afghanistan at the request of the Government and people of this republic. You can now see their formation. [video shows ancient buildings on a hillside, line-up of tarpaulin-covered vehicles -- some amphibious -- and formations of soldiers in front of a barracks-type building, close-up of soldiers armed with AKR submachineguns by the vehicles, shot of two doves on the tarmac with soldiers and vehicles in the background]

The leaders of Democratic Afghanistan, Soviet military leaders, and representatives of the public have come to the festivities. As always, kind words of farewell were heard. Our service men were handed high state awards.

Here is Senior Lieutenant (Gorishenko) who has today been awarded the Afghan medal for valor:

[Begin (Gorishenko) recording] We are confident today that the blue sky over Afghanistan will always be clear, and that it is protected by robust lands, strong in spirit. All these years the DRA servicemen and we have been bound together, not by service alone, but also by good human relations. We have helped one another, we learned from one another; and in the rare minutes of respite we rested together. Thus a fighting community, which is impossible to defeat, was strengthened [end recording].

[Leshchinskiy] Again the marches of the glorious Soviet Army ring out under the Afghan sky. In every formation there is a guide. You dress right by these guides and follow their example. In the ranks of the Soviet Armed Forces there are currently thousands of internationalist servicemen. This memorial, established over Kabul under the walls of the ancient citadel, is dedicated to their exploits.

[Video shows formation of soldiers armed with AKR submachineguns, AK-74 rifles, and light machineguns] Now, beside the memorial, columns of combat equipment of the anti aircraft gunners are going home, but there remains in this land, remains forever, the monument to the Soviet soldiers who helped defend the freedom, peace, and independence of the friendly people.

In the town all the streets are filled with people. All Kabul has come out to see off our servicemen. [video shows motorized column, led by a BTR-60 APC]

[Seyful-Mulyakov] The Soviet antiaircraft missile regiment is bound for the southern borders of our homeland. This journey began in the noisy streets of Kabul. It seems the whole town has come out to see off our servicemen on their way home, who have, shoulder to shoulder, become defenders of the April Revolution, and of the freedom and independence of Afghanistan. I remember these Kabul streets in the severe December days of 1979, when the deadly threat of imperialist intervention loomed over the friendly republic.

Today, as they see our servicemen off, both hoary old men and young patriots are saying to our servicemen, internationalist servicemen, a hearty thank you, for their courage and self-sacrifice, and for their kindness and humanity.

[Leshchinskiy] The Soviet regiment is passing through a living corridor of thousands and thousands of people. On April Revolution Square our soldiers were seen off by veterans of the PDPA and elders of the tribes. You defended the revolution, and we will never forget this, it is inscribed on the banners. Pashtonistan Square is a square of ancient traditions. The very youngest came here -- the tomorrow of Afghanistan. In their hands they have home-made placards saying "thank-you". The Russian word is today being pronounced by thousands of Afghan children saved by our servicemen. It is constantly repeated in moving letters and postcards which are being handed to the Soviet soldiers by the inhabitants of Kabul. Several thousands of Soviet soldiers, hundreds of thanks, and other combat vehicles are currently going to the north of Afghanistan, to the border of the USSR.

KAPITSA MEETS WITH INDIA OFFICIALS ON REYKJAVIK

LD172006 Moscow TASS in English 1943 GMT 17 Oct 86

[Text] New Delhi October 17 TASS -- Today talks between Mikhail Kapitsa, USSR deputy foreign minister and special representative of the Soviet Government, and the leading members of the Indian Government continued in the country's capital.

The Soviet deputy minister had meetings with Kocheril Roman Narayanan, minister of state for foreign affairs, Alfred Sylvester Conzavez, deputy minister of state for foreign affairs, and Gopalaswami Parthasarathi, chairman of the Committee on Political Planning of the Indian Foreign Ministry. The sides discussed problems of international politics in the context of the Soviet-American summit in Reykjavik and examined several questions of Soviet-Indian relations. The talks were held in a friendly and constructive atmosphere, characteristic of relations between the USSR and India.

DOBRYNIN RECEIVES INDIAN DELEGATION IN MOSCOW

LD202133 Moscow TASS in English 1958 GMT 20 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 20 TASS -- Anatoliy Dobrynin, a secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, today received a delegation from the Indian National Congress [INC] (I) led by Darbara Singh, a member of the working committee and the central parliamentary council of this party. The delegation is staying in the USSR at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee.

The conversation covered the pressing issues of the present-day international situation and dynamically developing Soviet-Indian relations.

The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee explained the substance of Soviet peace initiatives, dwelt in detail upon the results of the Reykjavik meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan and in this connection stressed the urgent need to step up efforts by all countries and peoples to safeguard peace and remove the threat of a nuclear war. Special emphasis was made on the importance of preventing the arms race from spilling over into outer space.

Anatolkiy Dobrynin stressed India's important and fruitful role in the campaign for peace and its activities in the Non-Aligned Movement and in the framework of the Delhi Six Group.

ING(I) delegation leader Darbara Singh spoke highly of the Soviet Union's efforts to protect peace, ward off the nuclear threat and preserve life on earth. He made a special mention of the fact that Mikhail Gorbachev's proposals in Reykjavik had evoked broad response and approval in India. Dabara Singh said that India maintained a consistent stand for a ban on nuclear testing and against the "star wars" plans.

The sides expressed mutual satisfaction with all-round development and strengthening of Soviet-Indian relations on the solid basis of a treaty of peace, friendship and cooperation between the USSR and India as meeting the fundamental interests of the people of both countries and the cause of peace and security in Asia and the world as a whole.

GROMYKO RECEIVES INDIAN ENVOY; TIES DISCUSSED

LD201239 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1130 GMT 20 Oct 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Today in the Kremlin Comrade Gromyko received India's ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the USSR, Triloki Nath Kaul, at the latter's request. During the conversation certain issues were discussed concerning the international situation and bilateral links between the Soviet Union and India.

VAVILOV HITS U.S. CENTCOM CHIEF'S PAKISTAN VISIT

LD202339 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1535 GMT 20 Oct 86

["Washington Steps Up Tension" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 20 Oct (TASS) -- TASS observer Valeriy Vavilov writes:

Transatlantic visits to Pakistan have become commonplace. No sooner had Defense Secretary C. Weinberger been seen off than another U.S. guest, General George B. Crist, head of the U.S. Central Command (Centcom), arrived in Islamabad.

If the Pentagon head, availing himself of the tribune granted him by the Pakistani authorities for spurious anti-Soviet and anti-Afghan fabrications, strove to justify efforts to further militarize the country and step up the undeclared war against the DRA, the Centcom commander is resolving strictly practical problems in Pakistan. He effectively carried out an inspection of his territory, for Pakistan is one of 19 countries forming part of the command's sphere of operation, which covers the vast area of the Indian Ocean, and the littoral states of Southeast Asia, the Near East, and Africa. Centcom, headed by G.B. Crist, was established by the Pentagon for the express purpose of "planning and conducting combat operations" in this vast region.

The general also regards the territory of Pakistan as "a natural bridgehead" for the operations of the "Rapid Deployment Force", almost 300,000 strong, under his command. These hand-picked U.S. units, whose task, in the designs of the Pentagon, is to play the part of gendarme in the hot-spots of the planet, need bases and a network of arms-, ammunition-, and equipment-dumps, so as to unleash an armed adventure at any moment against any country not to Washington's liking.

In accordance with an accord reached as long ago as 1983, the "Rapid Deployment Force" can use Pakistani military bases in Karachi, Gwardar, and Peshawar for the transshipment of U.S. troops and military equipment, while U.S. warships can enter Pakistani ports at any time. Having obtained control of such a convenient bridgehead, G.B. Crist sees it as his military duty to inspect it, and maintain a potential theater of military operations in a state of constant combat readiness for the implementation of the tasks of the policy of neoglobalism.

The U.S. general's tour of inspection in Pakistan was quite obviously timed for the latest events in Afghanistan, from which six regiments of the limited contingent of Soviet servicemen temporarily stationed there at the request of the DRA Government are now returning to the homeland.

Instead of giving a positive reply to a major constructive step by the Soviet Union, aimed at speeding up a political settlement to the situation surrounding Afghanistan, Washington is trying to create additional obstacles on the road to such a settlement, while continuing the militarization of Pakistan, involving it even deeper in the undeclared war against the DRA, supporting the bands of anti-Afghan counterrevolutionary riff-raff, and turning the country into a bridgehead of aggression in Asia.

CAMBODIA ACCUSES THAIS OF ESCALATING WAR

PM200959 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Oct 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent Yu. Gatselyuk report: "Thailand-Cambodia" Attack by Saboteurs in Which Western Journalists Took Part"]

[Text] Hanoi -- The SPK news agency reports from Phnom Penh that a People's republic of Kampuchea [PRK] Foreign Ministry spokesman has issued a statement which accuses Thailand of escalating the undeclared war against Cambodia. The statement points out:

On 20 September 1986 a group of Pol Pot saboteurs supported by Thai soldiers organized an attack against PRK territory in the region of (Makkhun) village, (Kip) commune, (Sisophon) district, Batambang Province, 10 km inland from the Thai border. It must be stressed that several Western journalists took part in this act of provocation.

Servicemen of the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Army and the local population gave the provocateurs a fitting rebuff during which several violators were killed. There are also some wounded and prisoners.

This example proves that the Thai authorities are not only continuing to let their country's territory be used as a refuge for the Pol Pot holdouts and are not only energetically supporting their provocative activity against the PRK but are also conniving at the involvement of Western journalists in these operations. On this occasion two journalists were casualties of the Pol Pot supporters' unlawful actions, the statements emphasizes.

The PRK resolutely condemns the unlawful activity and all those involved in it who are trying to violate the PRK's independence, territorial integrity, and sovereignty. At the same time, Cambodia states that it bears no responsibility for the security of journalists or of any other foreign representatives who take part in acts of sabotage against the Cambodian people. It demands an immediate end to all acts of provocation which violate its sovereignty.

COMMENTARY VIEWS U.S. ARMS STOCKPILE IN THAILAND

BK200630 Moscow in Lao to Laos 1300 GMT 15 Oct 86

[Text] In connection with the public statement by Thai Foreign Minister Air Chief Marshal Sitthi Sawetsila that Thailand and the United States have agreed to set up a U.S. arms stockpile in the Kingdom of Thailand, Radio Moscow commentator Ella Zhukova has the following views:

Before agreement could be reached, the talks dragged on for some time. The Thai side was in no hurry to come up with any answers as it pondered how much this would contribute to national security. As for the reaction of ordinary Thai people, it can be clearly judged from a protest rally held in Bangkok during U.S. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger's visit to hold talks with Thai Prime Minister Prem Tinsulanon on the establishment of the U.S. arms stockpile in Thailand.

The THAI RAT newspaper wrote in an editorial that the plan to set up a U.S. arms stockpile in Thailand would meet opposition from the Thai people because it would have an adverse effect on the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Kingdom of Thailand.

Nevertheless, agreement on this matter has already been reached. The Thai government claims that the U.S. arms stockpile is necessary for Thailand because it will act as a deterrent against any external attack. However, the people in many other Asian countries, like the Thai people themselves, believe that there are several other reasons behind the move to set up a U.S. arms stockpile in Thailand. The Japanese [word indistinct] SHIMBUN newspaper reported that a source close to the U.S. Defense Department had disclosed that the strategic U.S. arms stockpile in Thailand is being set up to facilitate efficient and quick operations by the U.S. Rapid Deployment Force when some critical incidents occur.

What sort of incidents could be termed critical?

In recent history, the U.S. Government has, on several occasions, claimed that certain incidents are critical so that they can justify the use of force to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries. The BANGKOK POST newspaper likewise said that if the plan to set up a U.S. arms stockpile on Thai soil becomes a reality, the regional arms race will enter a new stage and regional conflicts will be intensified. This means that the U.S. Defense Department is not worried about the security of the Kingdom of Thailand but wants Thailand to take a more active role in implementing U.S. strategies in this region.

Neither do Bangkok newspapers deny the possibility that the U.S. arms stockpile in Thailand will pave the way for the United States to reactivate its military role in Thailand. As is known, America's military role in Thailand ended following the failure of the U.S. war of aggression in Indochina in 1976. The Thai side also will not deny this possibility. The reason why the Thai people are afraid about the return of the U.S. armed forces to Thailand is due to the fact that during his visit to Bangkok in April this year, U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger stated that U.S. soldiers would be assigned to guard the U.S. arms stockpile. Another reason the Thai people feel uneasy about this development is that so far the U.S. side has not yet clearly informed the Thai side what types of weapons will be stockpiled in Thailand and who will guarantee that the United States does not store nuclear weapons in the Kingdom of Thailand as it has done in the Philippines. This is because the U.S. warlords are eager to set up more military bases along their Asian defense line, which is linked to the star wars program. It is reported that Thailand has been approached and is expected to play a role in this program. The arms stockpile, however, will not serve any useful purpose whatsoever to the security and stability of the Kingdom of Thailand as has been repeatedly claimed by the U.S. Administration.

FURTHER ON SHEVARDNADZE VISIT TO ROMANIA

Meeting With Totu

PM200911 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Oct 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Text] Bucharest 15 Oct (TASS) -- An official visit of friendship of Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, to Romania began today. Eduard Shevardnadze had talks with Romania's foreign minister, Ioan Totu, an alternate member of the Political Executive Committee of the Romanian Communist Party.

The two foreign ministers noted with satisfaction the progressive and fruitful development of bilateral cooperation in the political, economic, scientific, technological and cultural fields. They expressed their mutual desire to continue to make further efforts to strengthen relations of friendship and comprehensive cooperation under the accords reached by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Nicolae Ceausescu, general secretary of the Romanian Communist Party and president of the Socialist Republic of Romania, in Moscow last May.

The sides had an in-depth exchange of opinion on outstanding international problems. They stressed that the main task facing mankind today was to remove the threat of nuclear catastrophe. Special importance was attached in this context to the Soviet-American meeting in Reykjavik. Although it failed to produce concrete accords on problems of the limitation and reduction of nuclear armaments and the non-extension of the arms race into outer space because of the stand taken by the U.S. Administration, the latest compromise proposals tabled by the Soviet Union have basic importance. They are putting struggle for nuclear disarmament onto a higher plane and offering a possibility for a dramatic turnaround in international relations and for developing peaceful cooperation among states.

It was noted that in the current qualitatively new situation the sides were fully resolved in close cooperation with the other Warsaw Treaty countries further to build up efforts to secure radical reductions in and the total abolition of nuclear weapons, and also to improve the world situation.

The talks passed in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding.

On the same day Ioan Totu gave a dinner in honor of Eduard Shevardnadze.

Meeting With Ceausescu

PM161347 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Oct 86 First Edition p 4

[Text] Bucharest, 5 Oct (TASS) -- There was a meeting here today between N. Ceausescu, general secretary of the RCP, president of the Socialist Republic of Romania, and E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, USSR minister of foreign affairs, who has come here in connection with the session of the Committee of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of Warsaw Treaty states being held in the Romanian capital.

E.A. Shevardnadze informed N. Ceausescu in detail about the meeting held in Reykjavik between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan. Particular attention was paid to the new constructive proposals put forward at the meeting by M.S. Gorbachev, the implementation of which would make it possible to rid mankind of the nuclear threat and radically improve the world situation.

The sides expressed the hope that the U.S. Administration will also make its contribution to the attainment of mutually acceptable accords in the field of limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons and the improvement of the international situation as a whole. This would serve the interests of all countries and peoples.

Taking part in the conversation, which was held in a warm and comradely atmosphere and in the spirit of complete mutual understanding, was Ye. M. Tyazhelnikov, ambassador of the USSR in the Socialist Republic of Romania.

Further on Ceausescu Meeting

LD161941 Moscow TASS in English 1832 GMT 16 Oct 86

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] In the course of their conversation the sides discussed ways of further broadening and improving Soviet-Romanian cooperation and concerted actions of the two countries on the international scene.

They reiterated their shared desire for the continuous development of fraternal relations between the CPSU and the Romanian Communist party, between the USSR and Romania on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism, international solidarity, equality, mutual respect and comradely assistance. They unanimously noted that better use should be made of the available opportunities in every area of cooperation in order to strengthen Soviet-Romanian contacts in every way.

Discussing the key problems of world politics, the sides concentrated on the further invigoration of the efforts of the socialist countries and all the peace forces in averting the nuclear threat, curbing the arms race, promoting disarmament and establishing a comprehensive system of international peace and security. Special importance is attached in this context to the implementation of a complex of new initiatives put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev in Reykjavik, initiatives paving the way to a breakthrough in the development of international relations, the improvement of the overall world atmosphere and a return to detente.

Eduard Shevardnadze left Bucharest today upon the end of his official visit of friendship.

Shevardnadze Press Conference

LD162147 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1915 GMT 16 Oct 86

[Text] Bucharest, 16 Oct (TASS) -- Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, who is on an official friendly visit here, held a press conference at which he made the following statement:

Our visit to Romania ends with our meeting with you. We have an urgent need to share with the press a number of impressions about the events of recent days. I hope they will not be without interest to you.

In the first place, we have carried out a responsible mission entrusted to us by M.S. Gorbachev -- to inform the leadership of the fraternal socialist countries promptly about the content and results of the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Reykjavik, to expound our evaluations and to hear the opinion of our friends.

We had a meeting with Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu. During a very detailed and substantive conversation we analyzed in detail the Reykjavik negotiations and the situation that has arisen following their conclusion.

A working meeting of the foreign ministers of the Warsaw pact member states was also devoted to the results of Reykjavik. All the ministers highly evaluated the position of the Soviet Union and the course conducted at the negotiations by M.S. Gorbachev. In the difficult and dramatic discussion on the destiny of the world the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee defended the position not just of our state alone: he was acting in the interests of all the socialist countries, of the socialist community and of all mankind.

The Reykjavik meeting raises the moral and political prestige of socialism to an even higher level. It has shown the world how great is the price we are prepared to pay for a stable and reliable peace and how unshakable is our commitment to principle in the defense of its fundamental interests.

The Bucharest session of the Committee of Foreign Ministers of the Warsaw Pact member states has deepened our cooperation. Having exchanged views on the situation in the world in the light of the results of the Soviet-U.S. talks, we coordinated our further actions and defined the priorities and directions of joint efforts, whose aim is the implementation of the initiative of the fraternal countries to create a comprehensive system of international peace and security.

I would describe the Bucharest meeting of ministers as the collective creative work of responsible and equal partners, whose coordinated work substantially promotes the strengthening of our community and its position on the world scene.

Finally, our official visit to Romania and talks with our Romanian friends. During the second meeting with Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu -- it was a very lengthy conversation -- we had a fundamental discussion of the state and prospects of Soviet-Romanian relations. It was pleasant to see that both sides' desire to develop traditional fraternal links and contacts coincided fully, and that it was the common view of the basis that exists for this is growing in strength and breadth.

The negotiations with my counterpart, Comrade Totu, proceeded in a substantive, constructive and purposeful manner. We touched upon a very wide range of issues relating to international and bilateral relations and came to the conclusion that our two countries can and will cooperate even more closely in resolving the key problems of the present day.

Despite the strenuous schedule of the Bucharest meetings we were able to feel the pulse of the Romanian people and become acquainted with their achievements in the economy, science and culture. Nicolae Ceausescu, secretary general of the RCP and president of the Socialist Republic of Romania, briefed us on this in great depth. The hospitality and amicableness of the working people of the republic won our hearts, and we were profoundly moved by the respect in which they hold our country. The golden Romanian autumn with its generous fruits created a beautiful backdrop for our meetings.

And nevertheless, we continually return in our thoughts to what happened in Reykjavik on 11-12 October. The impressions of those days are superimposed on all today's matters, and the perception of them is all the more acute. All the more profound is the understanding of how difficult each step toward peace is. Never before has it been so broad as in those days at Reykjavik, and never before has it been severed so unreasonably as by our U.S. negotiating partners.

Why did this happen?

M. S. Gorbachev replied exhaustively to this at the press conference in Reykjavik in 12 October and in his speech on Soviet television.

However, broad discussion of the subject continues, and, in particular, reports are coming in which distort the true state of affairs. It is essential to comment on, so to speak, certain commentaries.

Whether it is relevant or not, our U.S. partners use the President's favorite phrase: "It's not that peoples distrust each other because they have a lot of weapons, but they arm themselves because there is no trust between them."

Well, if in Washington they are so greatly concerned about the problems of trust, they themselves should not undermine trust.

This is precisely what they are doing when they now state that they, allegedly, proposed to us the elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of the present century.

It is as if the sides did not reach a mutual understanding on this central issue in Reykjavik by confirming that they would commit themselves to eliminate all nuclear weapons, including ballistic missiles, by the end of 1986. The mutual understanding on this issue is of historic significance.

I would reconstruct a minute-by-minute picture of how in Reykjavik we came to such an accord. However, at present, dark smears are being placed on this picture. All these insinuations as to the imaginary violations by the Soviet Union of its treaty obligations and the inventions about its secret work in the sphere of defense installations are both irresponsible and immoral. The rhetorical passages to the effect that only talk from a position of strength forces the Soviet Union to agreement are immoral.

Great, very great is the U.S. military potential, but the potential for decency of some representatives of the administration has been seriously undermined.

In this regard one wishes to say: the times of the Talleyrands have long passed. Petty acts of cunning with great consequences which are characteristic of the age of secret diplomacy ought by now to have been shelved. When with bated breath millions of people look you in the face with hope and faith and listen to you, be honest with them. Do not distort, for example, what exactly was discussed in Reykjavik and how. This is an elementary demand.

Returns to Moscow

OW170441 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0110 GMT 17 Oct 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Eduard Amvrosyevich Shevardnadze, who was on an official friendly visit to Romania, returned to Moscow on 16 October from Bucharest. At the airport, he was met Comrade Chebrikov and other officials.

Communique on Visit

LD161557 Moscow TASS in English 1550 GMT 16 Oct 86

[Text] Bucharest October 16 TASS -- A communique issued here on the results of an official friendly visit paid to the Socialist Republic of Romania by Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and foreign minister of the USSR, has reiterated a resolve to act to advance fruitful Soviet-Romanian cooperation in the interests of both countries and peoples, the common cause of socialism, peace and international cooperation.

Eduard Shevardnadze was received by Nicolae Ceausescu, general secretary of the Romanian Communist Party and president of Romania. The Soviet and Romanian foreign minister held talks.

Pointing to steady progress in bilateral economic relations, they said that the implementation of a long-term program for developing economic, scientific and technological cooperation between the USSR and Romania through the end of the century was giving a strong impetus to the growth of trade, specialized and cooperative production, and cooperation in building important projects in both countries with the aim of meeting their economic needs for raw materials, fuel, machines, equipment and consumer goods ever more fully.

As they compared notes on international issues, the sides expressed profound anxiety over the persisting tension in the world and the increasing threat of war, caused by imperialists' policy.

Stressing the importance of a program for reducing armed forces and conventional arms in Europe along with corresponding cuts in military expenditures of states, which is a joint initiative advanced by the Warsaw Treaty members, the sides exchanged information about efforts made by both countries towards its implementation. They spoke positively on the activity demonstrated by the USSR, Romania and other countries in this issue.

The ministers, who paid much attention to the Reykjavik meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan, emphasized the importance of large-scale and far-reaching proposals made there by the Soviet Union, whose implementation would make it possible in a short time to bring about a fundamental turn for the better in international affairs, achieve progress in all areas of work for disarmament, fend off the threat of a nuclear war, and start moving towards a nuclear-free world.

They called for the dialogue to be carried on and voiced the hope that the United States would take a constructive, realistic and responsible attitude to the Soviet proposals.

Stress was laid on the high significance of the assessments and proposals made in the final document of the Bucharest meeting of the Foreign Ministers' committee of the Warsaw Treaty member countries as meeting the basic interests and aspirations of the peoples of both these and other countries.

The sides spoke highly of the successful outcome of the Stockholm Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe and stressed the importance of thorough preparation for the forthcoming meeting in Vienna and its conclusion with positive results.

The ministers spoke out for settling armed conflicts, tensions and contentious issues by way of talks, overcoming backwardness and establishing a new international economic order and for respect to be shown for the will and right of every nation to choose an own path of development freely, without outside interference.

The importance was stressed of strengthening the unity and cohesion of the member countries of the Warsaw Treaty which is an effective factor for ensuring peace in Europe and in the world as a whole.

CEAUSESCU NOTES IMPORTANCE OF REYKJAVIK

LD201336 Moscow TASS in English 1109 GMT 20 Oct 86

[Text] Bucharest October 20 TASS -- Romania believes that the results of the Soviet-American summit meeting in Reykjavik should not be all in vain, Nicolae Ceausescu, general secretary of the Romanian Communist Party and president of Romania, has told a rally in the city of Slatina.

Important issues of disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, were discussed at the Reykjavik meeting, he said. The sides drew closer to each other on some of them.

"Everything must be done now to reach as early as possible a number of concrete agreements designed to abolish nuclear weapons in Europe and in the world as a whole. Everything must be done to turn to reducing conventional armaments. There is no other way," Ceausescu said.

The Romanian leader called on the peoples of Europe and the world at large to rally their forces to ensure peace and international security.

CPCZ DELEGATION RECEIVED BY YELTSIN, OTHERS

PM201500 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Oct 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] A delegation of CPCZ ideology workers headed by J. Fojtik, candidate member of the Presidium and secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, left for home on 18 October.

Talks took place at the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Section, Moscow CPSU Gorkom, the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, the editorial offices of the newspaper PRAVDA and the journal KOMMUNIST, TASS, the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, the CPSU Central Committee Social Sciences Academy, and the Gorizont production association.

The CPCZ delegation was received by B.N. Yeltsin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom; N.N. Slyunkov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee; and A.N. Yakovlev and V.A. Medvedev, secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee.

The talks took place in a frank and businesslike atmosphere. M. Zavadil, CSSR ambassador to the USSR, took part.

HUNGARIAN DEFENSE MINISTER AWARDED SOVIET ORDER

PM171519 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Oct 86 First Edition p 2

[USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Decree: "On the Award of the Order of the October Revolution to Hungarian Defense Minister Comrade Ferenc Karpati"]

[Text] Moscow, Kremlin, 15 October 1986 -- For his services in strengthening the combat collaboration between the USSR Armed Forces and the Hungarian Peoples Army and in connection with his 70th birthday, Colonel General Ferenc Karpati is awarded the Order of the October Revolution.

A. Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

T. Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

ORZECZOWSKI MAKES STOPOVER EN ROUTE TO FAR EAST

LD191536 Moscow International Service in Polish 1400 GMT 19 Oct 86

[Text] Marian Orzechowski, member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and minister of foreign affairs of the Polish People's Republic, made a short stopover in Moscow on 19 October on his way to Australia and the Philippines. Minister Orzechowski was welcomed and seen off by Vadim Loginov, candidate member of the CPSU Politburo [title as heard] and deputy USSR minister of foreign affairs and other officials, as well as by (Anton Przygonski), charge d'affaires of the Polish People's Republic in the USSR.

KARPOV, OTHERS BRIEF WEST EUROPEAN OFFICIALS

LD182013 Moscow TASS in English 1941 GMT 18 Oct 86

[Text] London October 18 TASS -- Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher of Great Britain received Viktor Karpov, head of the Soviet delegation to the Soviet-U.S. negotiations on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva. During the meeting the head of the British Government was informed about the results of the meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan in Reykjavik.

Bonn October 18 TASS -- Viktor Karpov was received by Hans-Dietrich Genscher, minister of foreign affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany. Karpov also met with other members of the West German Government dealing with arms limitation and disarmament matters. The Soviet representative informed them about the results of the meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan in Reykjavik.

Helsinki October 18 TASS -- President Mauno Koivisto of Finland received Ambassador Vladimir Semenov, special envoy of the U.S.S.R. President Koivisto was informed about the results of the Soviet-American summit meeting in Reykjavik.

Stockholm October 18 TASS -- Sten Andersson, minister of foreign affairs of Sweden, received Ambassador Andrey Aleksandrov, special envoy of the U.S.S.R., who informed the Government of Sweden about the results of the meeting between the Soviet and U.S. leaders in the capital of Iceland.

Bessmertnykh Rome News Conference

PM171452 [Editorial Report] Milan L'UNITA in Italian 16 October front-pages a 600-word report on Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh's 15 October talks in Rome with Italian Prime Minister Craxi and Foreign Minister Andreotti, and the following exchange with journalists before leaving the prime minister's office:

"[Journalist] What is Gorbachev's assessment of Reykjavik?

"[Bessmertnykh] The summit gave us causes for both satisfaction and disappointment -- satisfaction at the understandings on offensive strategic weapons and missiles in Europe that were almost reached but not made official. For the first time in the nuclear era we were only a step away from the destruction of offensive strategic weapons within a decade; even the parameters for the destruction of American and Soviet missiles in Europe were agreed on; and an understanding was also reached on the Soviet SS20's in Asia.

"[Journalist] What were the causes of disappointment?

"[Bessmertnykh] There was disappointment at the fact that we failed to make these understandings official because the United States was not ready to come to an agreement on the whole range of issues. Faced with the choice whether to destroy nuclear weapons or continue reaching for their 'shield', the Americans opted for the latter course. But we hope that this will not be the U.S. leadership's final word and that Washington will return to realism.

"[Journalist] Is there a chance now of another summit?

"[Bessmertnykh] Yes, I do not rule out the possibility of another meeting between the two leaders, but it is more difficult now to talk about timetables and dates.

"[Journalist] Why did the United States say 'no' to the Soviet proposals on the space shield?

"[Bessmertnykh] It seems to me that the United States is still convinced that it can acquire superiority over the USSR by means of the space shield. But this is a serious error and if the United States persists in this error then relations between the two countries and the international situation will approach a period of destabilization."

RYZHKOVA GREETES DANISH PRIME MINISTER ON ARRIVAL

LD201252 Moscow TASS in English 1214 GMT 20 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 20 TASS -- Prime Minister Poul Schluter of Denmark arrived in Moscow today together with his wife for an official visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

At the airport the prime minister was met by Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, and his wife, and by other officials.

Ryzhkov, Schluter Hold Talks

LD201851 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 20 Oct 86

[Text] Talks between Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Poul Schluter, Danish prime minister, began in the Kremlin today. Questions of bilateral relations and key international problems were discussed in a businesslike and constructive spirit. The heads of governments said they favored stepping up the activity of all states on behalf of peace and taking constructive measures with the object of easing tension, curbing the arms race, and strengthening international security. Both sides gave a high appraisal of the fact that the leaders of the USSR and the United States had met, which is itself a step forward. The talks between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan have shown that the possibility of continuing political contacts and of reaching agreements on very important problems of the present-day -- disarmament and other issues -- does exist.

Overall, the exchange of opinions on international problems and on questions of bilateral relations made a better understanding of each other's positions possible, and enabled areas and prospects for the development of cooperation and mutual understanding to be brought out.

A dinner in honor of Poul Schluter and his wife was given on behalf of the government of the USSR in the Great Kremlin Palace. Present on the Soviet side were Comrades Ryzhkov and his wife; Aliyev; Talyzin; Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; and other officials. During the dinner, which passed in a friendly atmosphere, Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov and Poul Schluter exchanged speeches, which were listened to with attention and received with applause.

SHABAYEV: MOSAD BEHIND KIDNAPPING OF ISRAELI

LD210701 Moscow TASS in English 0648 GMT 21 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 20 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Boris Shabayev writes:

According to the Western press, a certain Mordechai Vanunu was kidnapped from board a yacht apprehended in the Mediterranean by "unidentified persons". He was the selfsame Vanunu whose sensational revelations recently enabled the British "SUNDAY TIMES" to throw light on Israel's secret implementation on nuclear arms programme, one of the most closely guarded "secrets of the century".

For nine years Mordechai Vanunu worked as a technician at Machon 2, the secret underground facility at Dimona, Israel's nuclear centre. Plutonium needed for the manufacture of atomic weapons is produced there. Vanunu's testimonies came as a bombshell. They confirmed how well-grounded is the concern that Tel Aviv's nuclear aspirations cause in the international public as a whole and in Middle East peoples in particular. Only some of Tel Aviv's Western patrons hastened to feign surprise: how come that, Israel, a small country, has the scientific and technological potential for the manufacture of nuclear weapons?

To freshen the memory of those who are apt to forget things too quickly, it must be noted that, according to reports of the Western press, Israel was supplied with secret information about nuclear arms manufacture back in the sixties by the United States CIA. A considerable amount of enriched uranium which was enough for the manufacture of a dozen of atomic bombs then mysteriously disappeared from the U.S. Numec corporation and turned up at the Israeli nuclear centre at Dimona. The centre which had the front of a textile factory had French equipment. France's former High Commissioner for Atomic Energy Francis Perrin confirmed that this equipment makes it possible to manufacture nuclear arms. Washington decided to stop the inspection of the nuclear center at Dimona in 1969.

There can be no doubt that when so dangerous a witness was "removed" from board the yacht, the Israeli secret service "Mosad" intended to put a stop to his revelations. But the dangerous nuclear aspirations of the Zionist rulers cannot be concealed. At the request of a number of Arab countries, the general committee of the United Nations General Assembly recommended to put the question of the Israel's nuclear arms on the agenda of the current 41st session of the U.N. General Assembly. It will surely condemn those who are dangerous playing with fire.

JOINT STATEMENT ON ARGENTINE PRESIDENT'S VISIT

LD171802 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Oct 86 First Edition p 4

["Joint Soviet-Argentine Statement"]

[Text] Raul Ricardo Alfonsin, president of the Argentine Republic, was in the Soviet Union 13-17 October 1986 on an official visit at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the Soviet Government.

President R. Alfonsin and those accompanying him were given a warm and cordial welcome, reflecting the feelings of respect and friendship between the Soviet and Argentine peoples.

President R. Alfonsin and those accompanying him visited Moscow and Leningrad, which enabled them to acquaint themselves with various aspects of the lives of the Soviet people and their achievements in the economic, scientific and cultural spheres.

President R. Alfonsin laid a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier by the Kremlin Wall. A wreath was also laid in the Piskarevskoye Cemetery in Leningrad.

During the visit to Moscow there was a meeting between R. Alfonsin and M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. During the conversation the two sides expressed satisfaction at the state of friendly relations between the USSR and Argentina, and key long-term directions for the development of Soviet-Argentine political dialogue and bilateral cooperation in various spheres were examined.

The Soviet-Argentine talks, which took place during the visit, made it possible to hold a constructive exchange of views on questions of the development of bilateral relations and a wide range of international problems.

Those taking part in the talks were:

For the Soviet side:

A.A. Gromyko, member of the Politburo and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium;
B. Yazkuliyeu, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium;
V.M. Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the State Foreign Economic Commission of the USSR Council of Ministers;
B.I. Aristov, USSR minister of foreign trade;
V.G. Zakharov, USSR minister of culture;
N.P. Kudryavtsev, USSR first deputy minister of the fish industry;
V.G. Komplektov, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs;
P.Ya. Koshelev, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations;
Colonel General I.A. Gashkov, deputy chief of General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces;
V.G. Vysotin, head of the International Relations Department of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium;
O.K. Kvasov, USSR ambassador to the Argentine Republic;
L.F. Kuzmin, chief of the Second Latin American Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs;

From the Argentine side:

Dr. Raul Ricardo Alfonsin, president of the Argentine Republic;
D. Caputo, minister of foreign relations and worship;
F. Bravo, ambassador of the Argentine Republic to the USSR;
J. Sourrouille, minister of economy;
Major General R. Erenu, chief of the General Staff of ground forces;
G.I. Lopez, press assistant in the president's office;
R. Lavagna, secretary for industry and foreign trade;
Senators L. Bravo and (R. Almendra); (Kh. Rodriguez), deputy of the National Congress;
J. Romero, under secretary for foreign economic relations;
Jorge Campbell, under secretary for industry and foreign trade;
L.E. Jaime, under secretary for maritime resources;
(H. Kort), president of the National Grain Board;
A. Tessio, advisor to the president of the Republic;
M.A. Espeche, director of the East European Department of the Argentine Ministry of Foreign Affairs;
(R. Da Bousa), national director for economy and finances.

The sides noted with satisfaction that relations between the two countries are deepening and are acquiring increasingly more varied forms. They reaffirmed their firm desire to develop also in the future bilateral relations in various spheres. All this provides evidence of the possibility of cooperation between countries with different socioeconomic systems on the basis of the principles of equality, mutual respect and noninterference in the internal affairs of states.

The sides noted with satisfaction the considerable strengthening and widening in recent years of the trade-economic and scientific-technical cooperation between the USSR and Argentina, which is based on effective long-range agreements concerning these issues.

The sides stressed the importance of the agreement on supplies of grain and soy beans to the USSR for 1986-90, signed in January 1986, and also the exchange of letters concerning the deliveries of Soviet machinery and equipment to the Argentine Republic in the same period, carried out at the same time

The sides reaffirmed their decisiveness to fulfill the mutual commitments proceedings from all the agreements undertaken by them.

The sides emphasized the importance of the recently signed agreement on cooperation in the sphere of fisheries and noted with satisfaction the successful development of cooperation in air and sea transport, expressing readiness for its expansion.

The two sides agreed to take the necessary measures to strengthen and develop a whole range of trade and economic relations. To this end they are instructing the appropriate departments to study the prospects for long-term cooperation, including the formulation of a long-term intergovernmental program of trade and economic, industrial and scientific-technical cooperation in spheres of mutual interest in accordance with the priority trends of the economic and social development of the Soviet Union and Argentina. This involves the adoption of necessary measures to improve the effectiveness of this cooperation by making it more diversified and stable.

They stipulated accelerating the review and expanding the specific projects of cooperation which were discussed during the talks and which are being discussed at present between the corresponding Soviet and Argentine organizations.

The importance of a considerable broadening of the participation of Argentina's private sector in trade and economic cooperation was noted.

Noting the fruitful nature of relations in culture, science and education, the sides agreed that their strengthening would contribute to the implementation of the agreement on cultural and scientific cooperation and, based on this, the signing of an cultural exchange program for future years.

The sides reaffirmed their readiness to develop scientific-technical cooperation, and in this connection they noted the importance of the visit to Moscow in May 1986 by the delegation led by the Argentine state secretary for science and technology. The sides expressed readiness to elaborate a new program for scientific and technical cooperation for 1987-88 which would envisage joint scientific research, the exchange of scientific workers and experts and also the organization of other bilateral measures, and expressed their readiness to confirm it at the forthcoming meeting of the joint commission for trade-economic and scientific-technical cooperation.

The sides expressed mutual interest in the establishment of cooperation in the sphere of the peaceful mastering of space, and with this aim they agreed to hold talks to conclude a corresponding agreement between the two countries.

In their review of bilateral relations, the sides agreed that the USSR national exhibition, to be held in November 1986 in Buenos Aires, will promote the development of business and friendly links between the two countries.

There was an all-round exchange of opinions on international problems. During the analysis the USSR and Argentina expressed deep concern about the exacerbation of conflict situations in the world, the exaltation of the nuclear arms race and over the danger of the arms race spreading into space. In the conditions of the existence of these extremely dangerous processes they agreed that the new way of political thinking is essential which would take account of the security interests of all states.

In this connection, the Soviet side explained its proposals on the complete and universal elimination of nuclear and other mass destruction weapons by the year 2000 and on preventing an arms race in space, and also explained its proposal to create an all-embracing system of international security and the 18 August 1986 statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The Argentine side noted the importance of these initiatives and stressed in particular its positive appraisal of the Soviet Union's decision to extend its unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions until 1 January 1987, seeing it as an important step which, if the other nuclear powers became a part of it, could open the path to nuclear disarmament.

The sides call upon all the nuclear powers to join in this moratorium and to come out in favor of the speediest conclusion of a treaty on the complete and universal ban on nuclear tests. In this connection the Soviet side positively appraised the new specific initiative on the monitoring of the end of nuclear tests which was submitted in the Mexican Declaration of the heads of state and government of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania and Sweden.

The sides are convinced that all states should play their part in the matter of eliminating the threat of a nuclear war, and to this end the Soviet Union and Argentina have stated their readiness to cooperate with one another and with all other states.

The Soviet side highly assesses the efforts of Argentina and the other countries in the "Group of Six" in the matter of strengthening peace and universal security, and their constructive contribution to the search for ways leading to an end to the nuclear arms race in all directions.

The Soviet Union and Argentina deem it necessary to intensify discussion of the problems that were the subject of the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva on nuclear and space armaments and questions of disarmament -- in the United Nations, at the disarmament conference and at other international forums with the aim of achieving as soon as possible specific accords and agreements, securing the reduction and curtailment of the arms race. They noted that existing agreements and treaties on arms control must be observed and implemented.

The sides advocated the development of international cooperation for the use of space exclusively for peaceful purposes and supported the creation of an international procedure for safety in the development of nuclear power engineering.

During examination of international issues, the sides expressed serious concern at the maintenance and aggravation of regional conflicts, which in the most negative way affect the political, economic and social development of countries in Latin America, Asia and Africa and affect the overall world situation. They firmly advocate conflict situations and disputes between states being resolved by peaceful means, with respect for the right to self-determination in accordance with the UN Charter and international law.

During examination of the situation in Central America, the Soviet Union and Argentina emphatically opposed the policy of all kinds of pressure and interference, and supported a Latin American solution for the regional crisis, the efforts of the Contadora Group and Support Group, and also the efforts of other peace-loving states directed toward a just political settlement in this region on the basis of full respect for the right of peoples to an independent path of development and for the principle of noninterference in the internal affairs of states. The Soviet Union noted the positive contribution of Argentina both within the Contadora process and in broad international efforts with the aim of normalizing the situation in the Central American region.

The Soviet Union gave a positive reception to the Brazilian initiative, supported by Argentina and other countries of the region, to declare the South Atlantic a zone of peace and cooperation.

The Soviet Union and Argentina support a principled position on the need to achieve a political settlement of the problem of the Falklands/Malvinas Islands by means of talks between Argentina and Great Britain on the basis of the existing UN resolutions. They favor the dismantling of the major military base set up by Great Britain on the islands, which presents a threat to the peoples of South America.

The sides expressed the firm conviction that a just and comprehensive settlement of the Near East conflict must provide, in accordance with UN resolutions, for the withdrawal of Israel troops from all Arab territories occupied since 1967, the realization of the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine, including their right to self-determination and to create their own state, and also the assurance of the rights of all states of the region to an independent existence and free development within the framework of secure and recognized borders. The sides favored the drafting and adoption of international guarantees for such a settlement. They confirmed their stand in favor of holding an international conference under UN auspices with the participation of all interested parties, including the United Nations, and the adoption of speedy practical steps to convene it.

The sides expressed deep anxiety over the Iran-Iraq war which is now in its seventh year and is causing suffering to their peoples, and called for a speedy end to this war and the immediate transfer of the conflict on to the path of peaceful political solutions. They stated their support for the international efforts directed toward settling the conflict by means of talks.

The sides stated their firm support for the unity, territorial integrity, sovereignty and independence of Lebanon within the framework of its internationally accepted borders. They expressed the conviction that a settlement of the problems within Lebanon can be achieved only by peaceful means on the basis of the national consent of all the Lebanese people.

The Soviet Union and Argentina, having reaffirmed that they oppose all forms of colonialism and racism, stated that they condemn the apartheid regime in the Republic of South Africa [RSA] and the government of that country, which conducts a policy of repression against the majority of its population and the continuing acts of aggression against the neighboring states. The sides spoke out in favor of immediately granting independence to Namibia on the basis of the relevant UN resolutions.

The sides advocated imposing sanctions against the RSA in accordance with the UN Charter. The Argentine side made it known that, in view of the RSA's policy of discrimination against the majority of its population and its aggressive actions with regard to its neighbors, it took the decision to break off diplomatic relations with the RSA from 22 May 1986.

The Soviet Union and Argentina favor restructuring international economic relations on a just and democratic basis and establishing a new world economic order, guaranteeing the economic and social development of states and a just solution to the problem of foreign debts, and express their support for holding global talks within the UN framework with the participation of all states aimed at solving the most important international economic problems.

The sides stressed the close link between disarmament and development, and the need to transfer the resources currently spent on military purposes to peaceful use, including the socioeconomic development of the peoples of the world.

The two sides noted the effective role of the Nonaligned Movement in the world arena and its contribution toward preventing nuclear war and maintaining peace, and toward resolving acute international economic problems. The importance of the decisions taken at the Eighth Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Nonaligned Countries in Harare was stressed.

The sides agreed that the Antarctic Treaty and the agreements supplementing it comprise a many-sided legal basis that has been operating effectively and dynamically for more than 25 years. This system has guaranteed the maintenance of peace in the Antarctic, nonmilitarization, its nuclear-free status and conservation of the environment, as well as the peaceful development here of international cooperation, thereby helping to implement the goals and principles of the UN Charter. Taking this into account, the sides advocated strengthening and further improving this international legal mechanism.

The two sides affirm their adherence to the lofty principles and goals of the UN Organization and advocate enhancing its effectiveness in resolving the key problems of international security and international economic relations. The usefulness of continuing ties between the governments, parliaments and other state institutions of the two countries was stressed.

The great significance of the development and deepening of the political dialogue between the USSR and Argentina, the implementation of regular consultations and the exchange of views on the issues of bilateral relations and topical international problems was noted.

The two sides expressed deep satisfaction with the results of the official visit to the Soviet Union of Raul Ricardo Alfonsin, president of the Republic of Argentina, the first visit at such a high level in the 100 years' history of relations between the two countries. This event marks an important stage in the development and strengthening of Soviet-Argentine relations in various spheres and creates new prerequisites for cooperation between the USSR and Argentina. Dr Raul Ricardo Alfonsin, president of the Republic of Argentina, invited M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to pay an official visit to the Argentine Republic. The invitation was accepted with satisfaction. The time of the visit will be subsequently agreed.

BRUTENTS ENDS ARGENTINA VISIT, ARRIVES PANAMA

PM131019 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Oct 86 Second Edition p 4

[TASS reports under the general heading "Delegation's Trip"]

[Text] Buenos Aires, 2 Oct — A CPSU delegation headed by K.N. Brutents, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Section, was here 24 through 29 September at the invitation of the Communist Party of Argentina [PCA] leadership.

The delegation had meetings and talks with PCA Secretary General A. Fava, other PCA leaders, the aktiv of the capital's party organization, and the Argentine Communist Youth Federation. All the meetings were held in an atmosphere of cordiality and fraternal friendship traditional for relations between the CPSU and the PCA.

Panama City, 2 Oct -- A CPSU delegation headed by K.N. Brutents, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Section, has arrived here at the invitation of the People's Party of Panama [PPP]. At Omar Torrijos International Airport the delegation was met by Ruben Dario Sousa, secretary general of the PPP Central Committee, and other leaders of the fraternal party.

SHEVARDNADZE, CUBAN ENVOY HOLD 'FRIENDLY' TALKS

LD202036 Moscow TASS in English 2025 GMT 20 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 20 TASS -- Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, received today Julio Camacho Aguilera, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba, ambassador of Cuba to the USSR.

During the conversation held in an atmosphere of fraternal friendship and complete mutual understanding which are typical of the Soviet-Cuban relations the sides pointed out with satisfaction the steady development of Soviet-Cuban cooperation in all spheres which was based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism.

It was stated that the resolutions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 3rd Congress of the Communist Party of Cuba had given an additional impetus to a further deepening of bilateral relations and to the raising of their effectiveness.

Eduard Shevardnadze dwelt upon the result of the meeting of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan in Reykjavik and devoted special attention to the new constructive proposals put forward by the Soviet Union there. These proposals, if put into effect, would mark the beginning of a nuclear-free age in the history of humanity.

Julio Camacho stressed that the Cuban leadership highly appreciated the performance of Mikhail Gorbachev in Reykjavik and pointed out that the government and people of Cuba fully supported the innovative policy of the USSR aimed at achieving a real turn for the better in international affairs and at warding off the menace of a nuclear war.

On behalf of the Soviet Union Shevardnadze expressed support for the constructive and dynamic foreign policy of Cuba and solidarity with the Cuban people who were building a socialist society in difficult external conditions.

In conclusion he wished the Cuban ambassador success in his responsible work in Moscow for a further consolidation and development of Soviet-Cuban relations in the interests of peoples of the two fraternal countries.

SOVIET AMBASSADOR TO BRAZIL REPLACED

PM071447 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Oct 86 First Edition p 6

[Unattributed report under the general heading "Chronicle"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has appointed Comrade Viktor Fedorovich Isakov ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Brazil.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has released Comrade Vladimir Ivanovich Chernyshev from his duties as USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to Brazil on his transfer to other work.

LIGACHEV, OTHERS ADDRESS SOCIAL SCIENCE FORUM

PM071129 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Oct 86 Second Edition pp 1-3

[TASS report: "Teaching To Think and Act in a New Way"]

[Text] The rates of social progress and the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development depend to a considerable extent on the people's ideological and political maturity. An important role in training specialists armed with Marxist-Leninist theory, able to apply this theory in practice, and capable of thinking and acting in a new way is played by higher academic institutions. Clear-cut guidelines for their activity are determined by the truly revolutionary nature of our time.

The tasks of social science departments in light of the 27th CPSU Congress decisions are being discussed by participants in an All-Union conference that opened 1 October in the Great Kremlin Palace in Moscow.

Comrades M.S. Gorbachev, G.A. Aliyev, A.A. Gromyko, L.N. Zaykov, Ye. K. Ligachev, M.S. Solomentsev, V.M. Chebrikov, V.I. Dolgikh, B.N. Yeltsin, N.V. Talyzin, A.P. Biryukova, A.F. Dobrynin, M.V. Zimyanin, V.A. Medvedev, V.P. Nikonov, G.P. Razumovskiy, A.N. Yakovlev, and I.V. Kapitonov were greeted with applause.

Deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers, chiefs of CPSU Central Committee sections, secretaries and chiefs of science and educational institution sections of union republic communist party central committees and party kraykoms and obkoms, scientists, leaders of a number of ministries and departments, and rectors and secretaries of party organizations at the country's leading VUZes are taking part in the conference's work.

The conference was opened by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. His speech was listened to with great attention and greeted with prolonged applause.

Then a report was presented by Ye. K. Ligachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. He stressed the key significance of the speech just heard from Comrade M.S. Gorbachev for party ideological work and also for the subsequent course of the conference. The speech developed the 27th CPSU Congress directives relating to the people's ideological and political education and to expanding and deepening scientific research in the sphere of Marxism-Leninism.

The whole of party activity since the April (1985) Central Committee Ye. K. Ligachev continued, has essentially signified a decisive confirmation of the close connection between ideology and life, and unity word and deed. Deviations from this principle has been allowed in the past, which led to negative phenomena in the functioning of the economy, retarded development of the social sphere, caused the moral climate to deteriorate, and engendered serious defects in cadre policy. It is to the credit of the party that it realized in good time the urgent need for a sharp change of direction in the country's development. By April 1985 forces has gathered in the Central Committee -- the leading core of the party -- which correctly appraised the situation in the economy and in society and put forward the idea of speeding up our development, which was thoroughly developed from every angle at the 27th CPSU Congress.

In just a short time after the CPSU Central Committee put forward the concept of acceleration the entire party had done a considerable amount of work to put it into practice. First of all decisive measures were taken to strengthen the leadership of party, state, economic, and social organizations both at the center and at local level. Firm cadre prerequisites were thereby created to implement the decisions of the 27th Congress and the course aimed at restructuring. A program was drawn up for the thorough technical reconstruction of the national economy on the basis of extensive assimilation of the latest achievements in science, equipment, and technology. A firm course was taken to ensure real -- not partial but total -- financial autonomy, the collective contract, and the transfer of enterprises and associations to a system of self-sufficiency and self-financing. In the production sectors a restructuring of the wages system is envisaged. Major steps have thereby been taken not only in the development of the national economy but also in the development of the people's socialist self-government and democratic principles in a decisive sphere of social life -- the economic sphere.

The sphere of economic interest in the end results of economic operations is expanding and concerns not only associations and enterprises but also territories: cities, oblasts, republics. The practice whereby any attempt to use goods produced in excess of the plan and saved resources for local needs was invariably regarded as a manifestation of "parochialism" is therefore becoming a thing of the past. It could be said that now the socialist principle "from each according to his ability, to each according to his work" is also being established at territorial level.

The structure of management of complexes in interconnected sectors of the national economy has radically changed recently. Local organs -- local soviets in particular -- have had their powers considerably broadened and their responsibility increased in comprehensively resolving economic and social questions and meeting the population's needs. In previous years the material base of the social and cultural sphere had fallen seriously behind the requirements of life: in public education, science, public health care, and culture. In the current 5-year plan the task has been set of ensuring progress in this sphere that is worthy of the socialist system. With the universal support of the working people, the party has waged a real -- not a verbal -- struggle against a serious social ill -- drunkenness and alcoholism. Both production and consumption of wine and vodka has fallen sharply. Energetic measures are also being taken to raise a barrier in the way of drug addition, which is appearing in some places. The strengthening of Soviet society's economic and moral foundations is also being assisted by the stubborn struggle begun by the party, the state, and all Soviet people against the acquisition of unearned income.

The report particularly noted the measures being taken to strengthen the material base of ideological work and propaganda. Plans have been worked out to renew the technical facilities at the disposal of our television and radio broadcasting, cinematography, and printing industry, a powerful boost has been given to a rapid increase in the production of domestic video equipment in the current 5-year period, and a program has been mapped out to radically improve the quality of cinephotographic material and magnetic media.

Our actions in the international arena have become more dynamic and enterprising and, the main thing, far more concrete. We boldly set about announcing and extending a moratorium on nuclear explosions and establishing international verification [kontrol] of nuclear weapon tests. This has sharply increased the effectiveness of our actions, brought us new allies, and enhanced our country's prestige throughout the world. Radical changes are being made to the practice of planning and managing foreign economic ties.

Having made it a firm rule to speak with the people only in the language of truth, the Central Committee does not conceal the vast complexities of restructuring. They are there in the economy, in politics, and in ideological work. The sharp change of direction now being taken by Soviet society is revolutionary in essence. For this to happen we will need time, resources, great effort by the party and the people, and civic courage and maturity in every Soviet individual. The main thing is to focus restructuring on ourselves and respond to the party's appeal with action and high results in work.

Some times, Ye.K. Ligachev continued, the question is asked: Why do we have to set about solving some problems many times over? What can I say? We are following untrodden paths, overcoming considerable difficulties -- both objective and subjective. V.I. Lenin taught: "We will have to hone, remold, and start all over again more than once. Every step we succeed in taking forward and upward in the task of developing productive forces and culture must be accompanied by honing and remolding our Soviet system." It is quite clear that "honing, remolding, and starting all over again" will also apply when we come up against stagnation and forces of inertia retarding our development. We should draw just one conclusion from Lenin's instructions: We must not evade urgent issues but set about resolving them over and over again until what we have begun is seen through to the very end. This is precisely how our party is acting.

Marxism-Leninism, as a unified revolutionary teaching, serves as an unshakeable ideological basis for the changes taking place in Soviet society. The great transforming strength of this teaching lies in its capacity for constant renewal and in the scientific objectivity of the laws of social development it has revealed. Marxism-Leninism arms us with a reliable method and an unfailing instrument to apprehend nature, society, and ideas. Our party and its theoretical cadres have done a great deal in analyzing the problems of the theory and practice of building a new society. The 27th CPSU Congress set a shining example of applying the method of materialist dialectics to the analysis of present-day reality. The congress demonstrated revolutionary criticalness and irreconcilability to everything outmoded and obsolete, to any pseudoscientific junk and verbiage, and to any prejudices, even if they are dressed up in scientific garb. At the same time it worked out bold, large-scale solutions to the tasks it discussed and opened up new approaches to a number of what can be called classic problems of Marxist-Leninist theory. It put forward theoretical and political conclusions that are fundamentally new in essence.

The congress developed the teaching on the establishment of the communist formation, advanced our understanding of the laws of improving socialism, and revealed new ideas in the dialectics of the objective conditions and the subjective human factor in this process. Since the congress our ideas on the interaction of productive forces and production relations and on the methods of disclosing and resolving in good time the nonantagonistic contradictions that are in operation here have become deeper and richer in content. Conclusions of strategic importance have been drawn concerning the growing role of the social sphere, the increasing democracy and democratization of all spheres of public life, and ways of developing the people's socialist self-government and activating political and ideological institutions. The significance of criticism, self-criticism, and openness as the norms of the life and development of socialist society, the style and methods of party work, and tasks of strengthening ties with the masses were thoroughly discussed. The all-round analysis of the state of affairs in the world today was a major achievement of social thinking.

The congress substantiated the need for a new kind of political thinking in the nuclear-space age, disclosed the dialectics of the competition between two systems and the growing interdependence of the world community, worked out a program to create a comprehensive international security system, and gave a clear answer to the most burning issue of today -- the issue of war and peace.

The most important conclusions of the 27th CPSU Congress are generalized in the integrated concept of speeding up the country's socioeconomic development, which determines the prospects for party activity for a historically protracted period. It synthesized profound theoretical studies into the essence of every aspect of our society's vital activity. The congress stressed that the process of improving socialism is the more successful, the more active the role played by Marxist-Leninist theory in the interpretation of living practice. In this connection the task of improving the quality of social science research acquires great significance.

You must agree, Comrades, Ye. K. Ligachev continued, that our conference must take a particularly responsible approach to the conclusion drawn in the Central Committee Political Report that our philosophical, economic, and all social sciences are somewhat distanced from the requirements of life.

Of course, this does not mean denying the achievements made in philosophy, political economy, and the historical sciences. Nevertheless, the state of affairs in the social sciences as a whole at present is by no means in line with the demands of the time. Grayness, tedious repetition of truisms, fear of innovation, and dogmatism have unfortunately become widespread. Cliquishness and an atmosphere of mutual eulogizing and bragging frequently flourish in science collectives, and the ability for critical appraisal of one's own place in science is lost. Attempts are made to reduce the restructuring process in these collectives to slogans and routine fits of political blather.

Discussing shortcomings in the social sciences, the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee devoted a great deal of attention to the state of affairs in philosophy. Through the efforts of some scientists, he said, this great science is now, perhaps, the most remote from life. We have very few philosophical works that are intelligible and interesting to the people and would arouse a broad public response. There are few profound works on the broad range of problems relating to the scientific and technical revolution. The theory and practice of sociological research are seriously behind the demands of the time. The state of affairs in the development of the theory of scientific communism is no better. By its very nature this science should breathe the life and passion of struggle and illuminate with its ideas the most advanced positions of communist building. Instead, even here one may frequently encounter the same timidity of thought, a lack of the civic courage without which there is no true scientist, and a reluctance to get down to the study of the serious problems of Soviet society's development.

Serious concern is being caused by the present state of historical party research. The depersonalization of many historical events and the periodic rewiring of this science's pages has a negative effect. The history of Lenin's party of outstanding figures in this party, and of the millions of communists who dedicated their lives to the struggle for the most noble ideas is often turned into dry description, and many books and articles on history are written in under expressive language and do not find a broad reading public. [paragraph continues]

Institutions and organizations responsible for developing this branch of knowledge -- primarily the Institute of Marxism-Leninism -- should look thoroughly into the problems that have accumulated in this sphere and find a solution to them.

A great deal of work lies ahead, Ye.K. Ligachev stressed. For this work to be successful it is very essential to create a zone of high intellectual effort and questioning, so to speak, in social science collectives. A reliable way to do this is through normal creative discussions. They are expected to serve as an effective method of increasing scientific knowledge. A high standard of discussion is incompatible with labeling and criticizing people for imaginary deviations from socialism. These are all methods with no bearing on real science, real creativity, or real Marxism. "It is essential to grasp the indisputable fact," V.I. Lenin wrote, "that a Marxist must consider real life and the precise facts of REALITY [capitalize word printed in boldface] rather than continue to hold onto the theory of yesterday..." In exactly the same way, the party position of today's scientist is not determined by his ability to adapt to fixed views but by his ability to scientifically substantiate changes within society and his determination to help to strengthen socialism in practice. In short, restructuring the social sciences in accordance with the spirit and letter of the 27th CPSU Congress is a complex, multifaceted task. It must be done, however, and without delay. The political and ideological prerequisites for this area are already present in society.

The report went on to examine questions relating to restructuring the country's higher and secondary specialist education system. It was stressed that higher education's successes in building the new society are well known. However, stagnant phenomena have recently accumulated in higher education and the "bulk approach" has begun to predominate in the training of specialists. The influx of capable young people to teaching collectives has diminished. This kind of situation is unacceptable for the country. It has become intolerable even for VUZ workers themselves. The CPSU Central Committee draft "Basic Guidelines for Restructuring the Country's Higher and Secondary Specialist Education" has not only been discussed in VUZ collectives -- it has been discussed virtually everywhere. The CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education, and the editorial boards of central publications received a large number of proposals and additions to the text. A considerable proportion of these were considered when producing the final version of the draft. It can therefore be said that the main party document on restructuring higher education embodies the collective reason, life experience, and hopes of millions of Soviet people.

The main aim of the restructuring process that has begun is to ensure a radical improvement in the efficiency of the system that trains, retrains, and raises the qualifications of specialists in close connection with an improvement in their use in the national economy.

What features must be shaped in the personality of the student in order to forge him into a contemporary Soviet specialist? First of all -- boundless loyalty to the cause of the party and the people and a clear understanding of the meaning of the changes occurring in society and of his own role in their realization. Today's specialist is, of course, a true professional and a skilled production organizer capable of independently making decisions and putting them into practice. It is extremely important to shape in the future specialist a sense of patriotic pride for the progress of Soviet science and technology and for the high standard of Soviet production.

Mikhail Vasilyevich Lomonosov, our great scientist, once said: "The honor of the Russian people demands that they show their ability and sharpness in the sciences and that our fatherland be able to use its own sons not only in military bravery and other important affairs, but also in the discussion of great knowledge."

Since those words were spoken the world has seen for itself many times over that our country's people have outstanding scientific, engineering, and inventive talents. The names of the great physiologist Pavlov, the inventor of radio Popov, the founder of contemporary aerodynamics Zhukovskiy, the father of astronautics Tsiolkovskiy, and the creator of the periodic system of elements Mendeleyev are passed from generation to generation. The names of our contemporaries Kurchatov, Korolev, Keldysh, Tupolev, and many others who have enriched mankind with their innovation and who have demonstrated to the world today our "ability and sharpness in the sciences" are covered in glory. All the more alarming therefore is the recent loss among some of our scientists, engineers, designers, and specialists of a sense of professional pride and a desire to grasp everything with their own intellect. The "acquisition through import" epidemic has become widespread, as if there is no other way of ensuring technological progress.

Of course, the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee stressed, we are far from the thought of cutting ourselves off from the outside world. At the same time, state wisdom and concern for the country's long-term interests caution against unthinking enthusiasm for imports. In the complex, contradictory, and struggle-filled world of today, our country has stood and continues to firmly stand on its own two feet. This is a great achievement of Soviet science, technology, and industry and of our cadres. It is an achievement to be valued and, while still at the VUZ, the future specialist must be inspired with the desire to advance our science and technology and ensure that our own manufactured goods surpass foreign models in all parameters.

It is extremely important to create the most favorable possible atmosphere for students who excel in their studies. A cult of learning, a cult of serious, selfless work to grasp facts and acquire new knowledge must reign in our universities and institutes. This is the prime responsibility and chief duty of the student. The higher education system is called upon to educate future specialists in a spirit of collectivism and comradeship and resolutely eradicate any manifestation of individualism, careerism, and indifference in the student environment. We must actively oppose the penetration into student collectives of the hackwork, grayness, and banality inherent in Western, so-called mass cultural goods reaching our country. We must more persistently and effectively shape healthy aesthetic tastes in young Soviet people.

In present conditions educating young people in the history and glorious traditions of the party and the people has become very important. We are all witness to the increased interest in the past and its lessons shown by literally every stratum of the population. This is just one manifestation of the new upsurge in Soviet people's patriotic feeling and their desire to comprehend the continuous link of time and the sources of the progressive national traditions which even today continue to impart life-giving force to our society. It is important, however, that the past be interpreted from a clear-cut outlook on life.

Ye. K. Ligachev dwelt on questions of improving atheistic education for young people and students. Sometimes, he said, encountering violations of the norms of socialist morality, some people start talking about the expediency of showing tolerance toward religious ideas and going back to religious morality. In this respect they forget the fundamental Marxist truth that religion is not at all a source of morality in man.
[paragraph continues]

It was not religion that gave people the moral norms that have now become common to all mankind. These norms were developed and consolidated by the popular masses during their many centuries of struggle against oppressions and violence from the rich and against the amorality and cruelty of exploitative society. The nature of communist morality has considerably enriched human norms. Consequently, there is absolutely no reason for us to narrow our moral ideas and move them backward, into the past. But this is exactly what some of today's followers of religious mysticism are calling for.

With the freedom of conscience that dominates our society, the absolute majority of Soviet people have long since firmly formed a scientific materialist, scientific atheist world outlook. This is not to the liking of our ideological opponents in the West. They pour a stream of slander on the Soviet system, claiming that the USSR suppresses freedom of religion and persecutes believers. Some statesmen in capitalist countries have allowed themselves to become involved in unseemly intrigues. But everything they say in this connection is a lie. In our country both believers and nonbelievers enjoy equal, extensive constitutional rights.

While being in favor of strictly observing the guarantees of freedom of conscience, the party also condemns attempts to use religion to the detriment of both social and individual interests. And we do come up against such attempts. Sometimes bourgeois nationalism dons the garb of religion. This is clearly apparent, for example, in the activities of the reactionary section of the Islamic, Uniate, and Catholic clergy. We must continue the search for new approaches, new ways and forms of atheist propaganda and work with believers. A big role in resolving these tasks can and must be played by VUZ social scientists.

The restructuring of higher education directly concerns social sciences departments. How and in what way must they restructure their work? Answering this question, Y.K. Ligachev said that VUZ's as a whole have a system for the study of social sciences. It is not a question of rejecting this system. Restructuring primarily means radically improving the quality of teaching and its effectiveness. To achieve this it is essential, first, to bring teaching decisively closer to practice and free lectures and seminars from simplistic concepts of socialism. We cannot be reconciled to the situation where one thing is said at lectures, but in real life the student sees something different. We must throw the doors of VUZ lecture halls open to life and turn every study period into a school of Marxist-Leninist analysis of today's topical problems.

The report noted in this connection that there is not enough Leninist truth in the teaching of social sciences at present. There are, of course, problems with programs, textbooks, and methods. But nevertheless the essence of the problem lies in the shortage of total truth. When a teacher evades the serious problems and contradictions of social life and skims over the surface, he is not educating the students but cramming them for an examination. Sometimes the truth is understood in a singular way. It is reduced primarily to discussions of negative phenomena. If this is the interpretation given, the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee said, then we are just as far from the truth as we are when we hush up shortcomings. Every phenomenon, dialectics teaches us, must be taken in all its diversity, perceiving both its negative and positive aspects. The main thing is that Leninist truth is a creative, constructive truth. It does not presuppose discussions of shortcomings but active struggle against them.

Second, a key feature of the restructuring process is raising the ideological, theoretical, academic, and methodological standard of teaching. It is particularly worrying that our VUZ graduates often lack an integrated idea of Marxist-Leninist theory. [paragraph continues]

Consequently, it is extremely important in the restructuring process to eliminate intolerable differentiation in the teaching of social sciences and remove the barriers between disciplines.

A major issue is preparing new textbooks. Those used at present have become out of date. A competition is now in progress to draw up VUZ textbooks on philosophy, political economy, and scientific communism. There are plans to announce a competition for a textbook on the history of the CPSU. The new textbooks must fully correspond to contemporary requirements and be in line with the tasks of restructuring social sciences teaching.

It is essential to overcome a formalistic attitude to organizing the academic process and reject the "question-and-answer" method under which the student is given a passive role. Social science studies must be combined with frank discussion of events that concern society and young people. It is important to be aware of student attitudes and the questions that disturb them. The attention of the conference participants was drawn to the experience of studying students' political interests and taking them into account when teaching social sciences that has been accumulated by the Department of CPSU History at Gorkiy University.

Third, restructuring means activating to the utmost scientific research work done by departments. The scientific work of the teacher is the guarantee of his professional growth and a condition of the pedagogical process' high quality. At the same time, departments' scientific research work is also very important for the country. After all, four-fifths of all our social scientists work in departments. However, the return on their research is very small. In order to improve this, we must more energetically introduce targeted planning to departments' scientific work and make better use of the unique potential of the VUZ science sector. It is also essential to remove literally everything that stands in the way of VUZ science in the form of far-fetched instructions, directions, and recommendations. Without this, there will be no improvement in educational and research work. The speech criticized the Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education, whose apparatus is one of the chief creators of bureaucratic duplication.

Success in the task of restructuring higher education and the work done by social science departments, Ye.K. Ligachev continued, depends to a decisive extent on the quality of party leadership of this process. VUZ party organizations now unite more than 375,000 communists, including approximately 112,000 students. This is a large force. There is a system of party leadership of social science departments in the Ukraine, Belorussia, and in the Leningrad, Novosibirsk, Chelyabinsk, and other oblasts. Party committees certify social science teachers. Regional conferences of departments heads are widely practised. In many cases scientific methodology seminars work effectively and have recommended themselves as a useful form of party leadership. Unified party organizations and councils of social science departments are being set up with the aim of increasing party influence and coordinating work. But as a whole the standard of party leadership of VUZ's, and social science departments in particular, must be decisively improved.

A key link in party leadership is the selection, placement, and education of the professorial and teaching cadres. The intellectual, ideological, political, and moral qualities of the teacher have decisive significance throughout the entire educational process. The teacher in Soviet higher education is a person with a high level of culture and a high standard of professional training. He is a person -- a person who is spiritually rich, single-minded, and who draws young people to him by the force of his convictions and the example he sets in his own life. We all, the secretary of the Central Committee said, remember words of A.S. Pushkin about his teacher. [paragraph continues]

"...He created us," the poet said, "he taught us fire...." It would be good if our students had more mentors whose memory they would always preserve. At the same time we must decisively avoid acting as guardians over students, trust them more, and give them extensive opportunities to independently resolve questions. Our leading cadres, party obkom and gorkom secretaries, ministers, and other party, economic, and soviet workers should take a more extensive, active part in educating young students. We must not begrudge time spent on this. It is a question of our country's future and of the people who will head our labor collectives and through whom we will have to conduct party policy and Marxist-Leninist ideology.

At present quite a few questions which demand solution have accumulated in the formation of social science teaching staff at VUZ's. The Central Committee resolution on further improving the system for enhancing the qualifications of teaching staff has not been fully implemented. There are other questions too. At present, for instance, around 5,000 social science teachers do not have a basic university degree. While at the same time in the country as a whole only 50 percent of social science university graduates are able to find jobs in their field. The practice of selecting students to study at social science departments also needs to be improved.

Party organizations must focus special attention on the development of criticism and self-criticism and openness at VUZ's and among their teaching staff. This process is clearly blocked here. We cannot agree with those who are trying to stifle criticism, who are saying "that's enough of criticism." This is not right. Criticism is a means of achieving progress in all our work. In many respects it is also a means of gauging this progress. At the same time, however, people who are trying to misuse the spirit of the 27th Congress and the development of criticism in our society for demagoguery and for achieving their own selfish ends must be most resolutely rebuffed. It is important for criticism to be always followed up with constructive action. The 27th Party Congress proclaimed: No organization, no leader must be beyond control, beyond criticism. The consequences of the violation of this principle can be seen in the example of the Institute of International Relations and the Diplomatic Academy. The practice of resolving questions in a narrow circle, nepotism in the selection of cadres, encouragement of toadying and unscrupulousness, and unwillingness to listen to the sound opinions of the collective -- all this led to serious negative phenomena at the Moscow State Institute of International Relations and the Academy and resulted ultimately in the withdrawal of the institute and academy Communists' trust in their leaders and the expulsion of the institute's rector from the party.

Of paramount importance in improving the party leadership of higher educational establishments is the revitalization of the work of primary party organizations at VUZ's. Without this, the task of restructuring and improving the teaching of social sciences cannot be resolved. It is the primary party organizations which must monitor the whole process of restructuring, ensure the expansion of the principles of democracy and self-management in the life of VUZ collectives, enhance the role of Komsomol and trade union organizations, and seek to improve the Marxist-Leninist training of all VUZ scientific and teaching cadres and the role played in this by social science departments.

In conclusion Ye. K. Ligachev emphasized that the state is channeling substantial means into meeting the needs of higher education. However, it would not be correct to proceed in the restructuring process from these needs alone. The restructuring of higher education must begin with the establishment of perfect order in existing facilities, with the unconditional fulfillment of the tasks set by the state.

For social scientists the academic year that has just begun is the first year of in-depth study of the 27th CPSU Congress materials by students and young people attending courses and professors and other teaching staff. There is no more important task than impressing on our country's young generation the wealth of ideas and the impressive scale of the aims contained in the congress documents. It is important cogently to reveal the fundamentally new, profoundly innovative nature of the decisions adopted by the congress, their organic link with the fundamental Marxist-Leninist principles governing the activity of our party, and their tremendous historical importance for the achievement of the communist perspectives of social development. The propagandization, study, and implementation of the ideas put forward by the congress is now the most important task of VUZ social scientists to which every social science teacher must devote his entire pedagogical talent and all his knowledge and strength.

G.A. Yagodin, USSR minister of higher and secondary specialized education, delivered a report entitled "The 27th CPSU Congress and the Tasks of Social Science Departments." Thanking the CPSU Central Committee for its exacting concern for the development of higher education, he emphasized that the present time has inspired a mood for intensive work to fundamentally improve the teaching of social sciences and to develop Marxist-Leninist theory.

The 3,392 social science departments at the country's VUZ's are staffed with 39,500 teachers. This represents a great intellectual and educational potential. However, it is not being utilized effectively enough.

The implementation of the course toward the acceleration of the country's socioeconomic development elaborated by the 27th Party Congress calls for a fundamental restructuring of all the spheres of social life, including higher and secondary specialized education, which provides the cadre backup for society's scientific, technical, economic, sociopolitical, and spiritual progress. The CPSU Central Committee draft "Basic Guidelines for the Restructuring of the Country's Higher and Secondary Specialized Education" envisages the integration of education, science, and production, a transition to new principles governing the mutual relations between higher education and national economic sectors, the enhancement of their mutual interest in improving the standard of cadre training and retraining and greatly improving the utilization of cadres in production and makes provision for the development of students' independence and creative abilities and the inculcation in them of a responsible attitude toward their chosen profession and toward their development into citizens of the socialist motherland.

Social science departments have a special responsibility to the party for the restructuring of higher education. Marxism-Leninism is studied by students in all the disciplines. It is important to bring home to every student the essence of the restructuring and its absolute necessity and to turn every student into an active and committed participant in this process.

It is the duty of VUZ social scientists to play an active part in the elaboration of the theoretical aspects of the restructuring. This is a question of the further creative development of the Marxist-Leninist theory, a study of the new phenomena and objective trends of social development, and the identification of effective social mechanisms and economic levers of the restructuring.

The social science teaching staff are the vanguard of the VUZ party organizations. They are in charge of propaganda work and organize the political education process.
[paragraph continues]

Their best representatives are as a rule members of party committees. Hence their great responsibility for the political atmosphere in VUZ's. They can and must do everything necessary to ensure an atmosphere of efficiency, exactingness, unity between word and deed, and comradely criticism and mutual assistance, that is to say the moral climate without which it is impossible swiftly and effectively to overcome the existing shortcomings and to launch along a broad front the struggle for the implementation of the decisions of the 27th party congress.

The main thing in social science teaching is quality. It is necessary to creatively renew its content and to overcome the chronic ills of formalism, pursuit of short-term political gains, and window-dressing in its methodology. Many teachers are guilty of simplistic, facile interpretations of the complex problems pertaining to our society's development and they avoid analyzing the new problems of the present time which perturb young people.

The ability to analyze reality from the positions of dialectical materialism represents the very essence of a realistic party approach. Only mastery of this approach makes it possible to reveal the whole truth and to teach students optimism in tackling and overcoming the obstacles along the path toward the achievement of the set aims. Graduates are frequently unable to defend their views in arguments and political discussions, and there is an obvious discrepancy between their theoretical knowledge and their actual behavior and philistine approach to life's values.

Attention is now focused on the substantial renewal of teaching programs and the whole methodological arsenal of higher education. It is important to ensure a new, higher level of integrity in the study of Marxist-Leninist theory, in ensuring the interlocking unity of its component parts -- the CPSU's historical experience and its present-day revolutionary practice. The integrated mastery of the revolutionary teaching will be assisted by the introduction of a state examination in Marxism Leninism which will provide a more comprehensive ideological, theoretical, and sociopolitical assessment of graduates than is the case at present. As a result of open competitions, the USSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education is planning to publish textbooks for philosophy, political economy, and scientific communism in cooperation with the Political Literature Publishing House in 1988.

A key task is to improve teaching methods. The restructuring demands that passive, scholastic teaching methods be replaced with active methods and real discussions on topical problems. The lesson in truth provided by the 27th Party Congress demands that students, and especially social science students, be enabled to obtain during lessons the correct answers to the questions which they are asking themselves daily. Unconditional priority must be ensured for independent work by students, to be carried out under supervision, with the necessary assistance and support. Allowances for this work must be made in the teacher's workload and timetable, and it must be obligatory on the student's part.

An important reserve for enhancing the quality of social science teaching is the deepening of their links with general science and special disciplines, the report noted. In order to enhance the standard of teaching it is necessary to tackle experiments more boldly and to grant greater independence to departments in teaching and educational work.

The restructuring has also begun in the sphere of scientific research which is the main precondition for the professional growth of teaching staff, the speaker went on to say.

We have tolerated far too long chronic ills in the development of social sciences such as the fact that much of the research work is divorced from the requirements of real life and that a genuine quest for the theoretical interpretation of practice is supplanted by schemes and arguments around the definition of concepts. The research work of a substantial number of departments has failed to bear fruit; sometimes teaching staff carry over the elaboration of one and the same problem from one year to the next, from one plan to the next, making no progress whatsoever.

Of late the contribution of VUZ social scientists to the implementation of concrete socioeconomic and ideological educational tasks has slightly increased. They are being called upon to take part in the drafting of social development plans for production collectives. The Ufa Aviation Institute, for instance, has elaborated questions of the stabilization of labor collectives in areas of new industrial development.

The Simferopol University Department of Scientific Communism has, with the assistance of the sociological laboratory, elaborated and introduced a system for the effective utilization of social production reserves at most of the city's enterprises.

Noting that the restructuring demands a substantial improvement of the ideological, political, labor, moral, and aesthetic education of students, the speaker said that science departments must play an increasingly active role in this multifaceted work. Their task is to inculcate responsibility in students for the quality of their studies and to create an atmosphere of strict exactingness.

The crucial nature of our times and the rivalry of the two world systems make it imperative to comprehensively intensify the ideological education of students and to enhance their political vigilance. Now, more than ever before, social science departments face the task of ensuring that every future specialist takes up a clear class stance.

Dwelling on the problems of molding the political and moral standards of VUZ graduates, the speaker drew attention to the importance of the study of the motherland's historical past, the problems of atheistic education, and the development of the spiritual needs of the individual. The experience accumulated in the study of humanities by specialists at Rostov University is highly interesting. At that university students of all disciplines study on an optional basis a range of subjects pertaining to general culture.

Among major problems the report cited the rational utilization of leisure by students with the aim of the all-around development of the personality and the firm establishment of the norms and traditions of a healthy, cultural, and sober way of life.

The fundamental questions of a modern approach to the teaching and education of students cannot be resolved without the all-around revitalization of the Komsomol at VUZ's, without the development of the system of student self-management in which Komsomol organizations are called upon to play the role of the main motive force. It is necessary to help the Komsomol at VUZ's to master the techniques of self-management and the skills of applying the norms of democracy, to teach it not to be afraid to display initiative and to overcome formalism.

Noting that the restructuring and the improvement of the quality of work of social science departments depends to a decisive degree on the quality of their cadres, the speaker declared that the proportion of teaching staff with scientific degrees and titles had increased over the past 5-year period and totaled 63 percent at present. The problem of the correct combination of experienced and young cadres, the continuity of generations at social science departments demands a radical solution.

We face majestic, noble tasks of tremendous party and nationwide significance, the speaker said in conclusion. The main milestones of the restructuring have been defined. It has started and no one and nothing can stop it. It is the duty of each one of us, every communist and every citizen, to find our place in this vital process and to devote ourselves to it, body and soul.

Then the debate opened.

V.S. Rakhmanin, head of the Voronezh University department of Scientific Communism, said that the restructuring must draw on the entire mighty and talented potential that exists at higher educational establishments and open up real scope for creativeness and a more vigorous resolution of the practical problems set by our party. Its real social effect will largely depend on this.

The speaker drew attention to the need to restructure pedagogical thinking on the principles of Leninist honesty. A lack of this honesty in the past has affected scientific research which ignored many acute problems and glossed over the negative phenomena of life. The speaker dwelt at length on questions of enhancing the effectiveness of scientific research and increasing the social scientists' contribution to the solution of specific tasks in socioeconomic development and ideological education.

Yu.V. Petrov, first secretary of the Sverdlovsk CPSU Obkom, emphasized that the party obkom rightly regards social science department staff as the best trained active fighters of the ideological front, reliable helpers in the study of the processes and phenomena that are taking place in life and in molding public opinion. He related how, after the 27th CPSU Congress, the party obkom addressed a questionnaire containing the following two questions to the oblast's working people: "What, in your view, do the reserves for acceleration consist of?" and "How do you picture your own contribution to restructuring?" In less than a month, he emphasized, we received 25,000 letters -- almost as many as we normally get in 3 years. The analysis of these letters carried out by party officials and social scientists has enabled us to identify the most characteristic shortcomings in our organizational and political work. Party committees amended long-term plans and adopted specific measures to eliminate the revealed shortcomings and social scientists acquired a large amount of useful material.

The speaker cited examples of the extensive involvement of social science department staff in the elaboration of topical socioeconomic development issues. He described how the movement of northern metal workers "Labor and social discipline -- guaranteed by the collective!" struggled for general recognition for more than three 5-year plans. The fact that it has won it now, the speaker emphasized, is largely the result of the staunchness and collective wisdom of metal workers and scientists. The party obkom will continue to back scientists in the struggle for innovation, against sluggishness and conservatism.

G.S. Arefyeva, head of the Moscow Power Industry Institute Department of Philosophy, emphasized in her speech that teaching as practiced at VUZ's to date not only is not conducive to the development of a creative personality but in a number of cases even hampers the molding of teachers capable of thinking for themselves. [paragraph continues]

This is largely the fault of the application of formalistic bureaucratic methods of work engendered by the gulf that separates theory from real life and its problems. This in turn was the consequence of the divergence between words and deeds whose essence was revealed at the 27th CPSU Congress.

The congress has cleared the way for radical transformations in our society that are long overdue. Certain promising changes have even taken place in the Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education: Purely formalistic teaching and methodological instructions have been abolished and the experience of departments and the suggestions of teaching staff are studied more attentively and with greater interest. Nonetheless, formalism has by no means been overcome. In this context the need was stressed to restructure the content of teaching in the direction indicated by the congress, to elucidate the topical problems of present-day social practice.

The theory and practice of the strategy of acceleration, the restructuring of all spheres of our life, questions of social policy, democracy, and self-management, the role and significance of the human factor, the trends and contradictions of the modern world — these are the problems addressed by the journal KOMMUNIST at present. I.T. Frolov, the journal's chief editor, emphasized in this connection that drawing up a comprehensive plan of measures to implement the CPSU Central Committee resolution "On the journal KOMMUNIST," the editorial office is critically reviewing forms and methods of work that have not proved effective and focusing on direct and operational links with labor, scientific, and creative collectives and readers. Here, the speaker noted, we count on the extensive participation of VUZ social science teaching staff. The party and society, he emphasized, urgently needs research into the various options for resolving the problems connected with the acceleration and the restructuring of our life. The discussion of these issues has begun on the pages of our journal.

The speaker further pointed out the importance of holding discussions in the conditions of expanding democracy and openness. The ability to correctly conduct discussions, he emphasized, demands high standards, intellectual agility, and responsibility.

In the speeches of the conference participants questions of intensified party leadership of the restructuring of higher education and improved teaching of social sciences were raised and ways of molding a scientific world outlook, inculcating an active civic stance in young people, and strengthening the links between the teaching process and practice were discussed.

The conference continues.

OCTOBER REVOLUTION ANNIVERSARY SLOGANS LISTED

PM191357 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Oct 86 First Edition p 1

["CPSU Central Committee Slogans for the 69th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution" — PRAVDA headline]

[Text] 1. Long live the 69th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution!

2. Glory to Great October!

3. Long live Marxism-Leninism, the eternally living revolutionary teaching!

4. May the revolutionary continuity of all generations of Soviet people -- the guarantee of the invincibility of the ideas and cause of October -- gain strength!

5. Long live the Communist Party of the Soviet Union -- the guiding and directing force of Soviet society!

6. Long live the unbreakable alliance of the working class, the kolkhoz peasantry, and the people's intelligentsia!

7. Long live the indissoluble fraternal friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union!

8. May the unity of the party and the people strengthen!

9. Working people of the Soviet Union! By dogged, conscientious labor let us translate into reality the historic decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress!

10. Citizens of the Land of the Soviets! Restructuring is a matter for each and everyone! Actively establish revolutionary transformations in the economy and in all spheres of social life!

11. Communists! By a personal example of industriousness and great purposefulness mobilize the working people for the implementation of the tasks set by the 27th CPSU Congress!

12. Komsomol members and young people! Boldly and actively join, in an innovative manner, in the solution of the tasks of acceleration!

Greet the 20th Komsomol Congress in a fitting manner!

13. Honor and glory to the Soviet woman -- ardent patriot, tireless worker, and solicitous mother!

14. Veterans of the party, of the war, and of labor! Continue to be in the formation of active fighters for the cause of communism!

15. Working people of the Soviet Union! Develop socialist competition! Enhance the rate of progression and do not permit complacency and placidity!

Let us fulfill the 1986 plan targets! Let us ensure a good start for the 12th 5-Year Plan!

16. Workers of the country! Persistently enhance labor productivity! Use all reserves for this in each collective and at each work place!

17. Glory to production front-rankers and innovators who are working selflessly according to the rhythm of acceleration and who are boldly breaking down obsolete norms and habits!

18. Workers of the national economy! Struggle for high product quality and for the honor of the Soviet brand mark! Create a reliable barrier to technical backwardness and botched work!

19. Working people! Be thrifty and strict in the struggle against wastefulness, and pursue a rigorous policy of thrift!
20. Workers of industrial enterprises, sovkhozes and kolkhozes! Introduce financial autonomy and the collective contract more widely! Let there be more independence, initiative, and responsibility for the end results of labor!
21. Scientists, engineers, designers, and inventors! Develop Soviet science, and more boldly set about devising and assimilating the world's best, fundamentally novel, equipment and technology.
22. Machine builders! You are in the first echelon of those fighting for the acceleration of scientific and technical progress! It is your duty to create new, highly productive, and reliable machines and equipment!
23. Working people in industry! Actively introduce new, progressive equipment, and strive for its efficient utilization!
24. Workers of the oil, gas, coal, and metallurgical industry! Reliably ensure the economy's needs for fuel, raw materials, and semimanufactures!
25. Working people in the chemical industry! Persistently enhance the level of the chemicalization of the national economy! Expand the production of advanced types of products!
26. Soviet construction workers! Build projects in the production and social spheres to a high standard and on schedule! Enhance the efficiency of the construction complex!
27. Working people in transport! Ensure the precise functioning of the country's transportation system! Ship national economic freight uninterruptedly!
28. Workers of the agro-industrial complex! Improve the provision of food for the country! Make wide use of intensive technology -- a reliable means for enhancing the productiveness of fields and livestock units!
29. Working people in public education! Improve the teaching and the communist education of the younger generation!
30. Working people in public health! You are entrusted with preserving the health of Soviet people! Enhance quality and responsibility in your work! Actively seek to establish a health way of life!
31. Working people in trade, public catering, and consumer and municipal services!

The mood of people depends on your work! Energetically develop modern types of services! Enhance the standard of service to the population!
32. Citizens of the Land of the Soviets! Be irreconcilable toward those who cause economic and moral damage to society, and who violate Soviet laws! Struggle resolutely against slovenliness, drunkenness, and unearned incomes!

33. Working people in management! Ensure the precise organization of the labor process! Improve the style and methods of work and eradicate bureaucratism, narrow departmentalism, and localism!

34. Citizens of the USSR! Participate actively in the further democratization of our society! Be masters of the country!

35. Long live the soviets of people's deputies -- the political foundation of the USSR and the chief element of the socialist self-management of the people!

36. Soviet trade unions! Develop the masses' labor activeness, initiative, and creativity, and seek to improve the conditions of their labor, everyday life, and leisure!

37. Soviet cultural figures! Satisfy more fully the growing spiritual requirements of the working people! Create works befitting the socialist epoch!

38. Soviet servicemen! Vigilantly and reliably safeguard the peaceful, creative labor of our people and the historic gains of Great October.

Glory to the valiant USSR Armed Forces!

39. Working people of the Land of the Soviets! Let us strengthen the cause of socialism and peace by shock work on the labor front of the 5-year plan!

40. Fraternal greetings to the peoples of the socialist countries!

41. Proletarians of all countries, unite!

42. Fraternal greetings to communist and workers parties! May the class solidarity and cooperation of the Communists of all countries in the struggle for peace and socialism gain strength!

43. Peoples of the world! Let us intensify the struggle for the improvement of the international situation and for constructive cooperation among states!

44. Peoples of all countries! Resolutely oppose the buildup of lethal arms, and advocate the ending of nuclear tests, and the total elimination of nuclear weapons! Let us not permit the militarization of space!

45. Peoples of the world! Struggle actively against the imperialist policy of violence, plunder, and terrorist brigandage!

Demand a political settlement to conflict situations in Central America, southern Africa, and in the Near East and Middle East!

46. Peoples of Europe! Struggle for lasting peace and good-neighborly relations and for detente and security on the continent!

47. Peoples of the Asian and Pacific countries! Pool your efforts for ensuring international security and peaceful cooperation in the region?
48. Long live the Leninist foreign policy of the Soviet Union -- the policy of peace and security of the peoples and of broad international cooperation!
49. Long live the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics -- motherland of Great October!
50. Following the Leninist course of the 27th CPSU Congress, forward along the path of communist creation and peace!

POLITBURO FIGURES ATTEND COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

LD202203 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 20 Oct 86

[Text] A meeting of the USSR Council of Ministers was held today at which the results of the work of the national economy over the first 9 months were examined, as were tasks connected with the fulfillment of the country's plan and budget, and issues relating to the work of the national economy in the winter period. It was noted that as a result of the selfless labor of the Soviet people in implementing the party's course aimed at accelerating the country's social and economic development, positive changes have been achieved in all spheres of the national economy. At the same time the USSR Council of Ministers noted that the transfer of the national economy on to a path of intensification is being conducted slowly, the process of restructuring is progressing with difficulty and with contradictions and frequently running up against the inertness of ministries, departments and local administration bodies, as a result of which a large number of labor collectives have, essentially, still not joined the restructuring.

The USSR Council of Ministers instructed ministries and departments of the USSR and councils of ministers of the union republic to draw up and implement effective measures to remove inadequacies and errors, and to secure unconditional fulfillment of the annual plan and of the socialist pledges undertaken.

Taking part in the discussion of the issues were Aliyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, Zayknov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and Talyzin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers addressed the meeting.

TURKMEN CP SACKS, EXPELS ATAYEV, MOLLAYEV

LD201455 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 20 Oct 86

[Text] A plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Turkmenistan today examined the question of gross violation of party and state discipline, complicity, falsification of figures, window-dressing, bribery, deceiving the state, and distorting the implementation of cadre policy in the Tashauz Oblast Party organization. Bayry Atayev, first secretary of the Tashauz Oblast Committee of the Communist Party of Turkmenistan; and Kabe Mollayev, chairman of the Oblast Executive Committee; have been removed from office and expelled from the party.

AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENTS FOR 15-18 OCT REPORTED

LD190318 [Editorial Report] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow Domestic Service in Russian, unless otherwise indicated, on 15-18 Oct GMT times off broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each item.

15 October

Kurgan Oblast: 1.25 million metric tons of grain have been delivered to state granaries. (0000)

Farmers in Saratov Oblast are coming to the end of the plowing of autumn fallow, with nearly 4 million hectares done. This work has been done earlier than last year. About half the fallow land has been prepared. (0703)

Belgorod Oblast farms have fulfilled the plan of sugar beet sale to the state: 3.2 million metric tons of sugar beet have been supplied for processing so far. (0900)

By the beginning of this week there remained about 300,000 hectares of eared crops to be harvested in the country. This is primarily in the Urals, in the areas adjoining the Urals, and in Western Siberia. (1200)

Azerbaijan has fulfilled its cotton production plan. More than 15,000 metric tons have been procured so far and the picking continues. (1200)

By putting 1.25 million metric tons of grain into storage, the workers of Novosibirsk Oblast fulfilled the task on selling grain to the state today. (1600)

Grain harvesting is proceeding on the 3 millionth hectare in Tselinograd Oblast. On the whole in the oblast, grain crops have been harvested on 80 percent of the total area. (2330)

16 October

In Novosibirsk Oblast, 1.25 million metric tons of grain have been delivered to the reception enterprises, completing the state procurement plan. Truck drivers from Moscow and Moscow Oblast, Smolensk Oblast and Dagestan, and army personnel helped to transport the harvest. Soil and seeds are being prepared for next year. (0100)

In Tuva Oblast, more than half the tractors are now in use for plowing. To date, about 70,000 hectares have been plowed, all by the shellboardless method [bezotvalnym sposobom]. The farms are fully supplied with high-quality seed, of which far more has been laid in than in previous years. (0100)

In Kazakhstan, plowing is underway on the third millionth hectare. (0500)

The 1 millionth metric ton of sugar beet was delivered today to the procurement stations by Orel Farmers. That is 130,000 metric tons more than the plan target. (1200)

Autumn plowing has been started up in the south of Turkmenia. (1200)

In fulfilling the state plan, Kazakhstan has delivered more than 16.4 million metric ton of grain, despite a wet May and a cool summer in the northern regions. On some 5.5 million hectares intensive technology was used. (1500)

Tajik cotton pickers have brought in more than 650,000 metric tons of the crops so far. (2230)

17 October

Altay machine operators have fulfilled the plan for plowing up fallow; 4.6 million hectares are ready for the next harvest. (0000)

Ryazan Oblast has fulfilled its sugar beet plan, delivering nearly 400,000 metric tons (0304)

Fergana valley has delivered more than 400,000 metric tons of raw cotton. (0304)

Cotton picking is continuing in Tajikistan. Over 760,000 metric tonn of raw cotton has already been procured there. Heavy rain which has fallen in the republic has somewhat reduced the rate of picking, but it is still better than last year. Leninabad Oblast has already gathered 77 percent of the target for the year. (0700)

Potato lifting has been completed in Bryansk Oblast, but replowing is immediately under way. As a result, an extra 30,000 metric tons or so of potatos have been harvested. (0900)

Kherson Oblast agro-industrial complex workers have met tasks for sale of grain to the state, with 1.265 million metric tons of grain laid in. Three times more grain of valuable and strong varieties has reached procurement points. (0900)

Sowing of winter wheat was completed today in Azerbaijan, about two weeks earlier than usual. It has been sown together with barely on about 30,000 hectares. This is a new agricultural technique. (1000)

Farmers in Kherson Oblast have delivered more than 35,000 metric tons of rice to the state. (1200)

Three Kazakh Oblasts, Alma-Ata, Dzhabul and Taldy-Kurgan, have completed sowing winter grain crops. Winter grain is now planted in Kazakhstan over 1.6 million hectares (1200)

18 October

Agricultural workers of Kazakhstan, carrying out the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress, have conducted the harvest in an organized way and have fulfilled the plan for the sale of grain to the state. At grain reception points more than 16.4 million metric tons of grain have arrived. About 12 million metric tons of the main food crop, wheat, has been procured, of which 80 percent is of the strong, hard and valuable varieties. The largest contribution in grain resources was made by Kustanay Oblast, having sold 3.738 million metric tons of grain to the state; Kokchetav Oblast with 2.451 million t; tselinograd Oblast with 2.332 million metric tons; Severokazakhstanskaya Oblast with 1.421 million metric tons Pavlodar Oblast with 866,000 metric tons. The sale of grain to the state continues. (1600)

PROGRESS OF HARVEST, WINTER CROPS NOTED

LD170637 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 15 Oct 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The latest report of the USSR Central Statistical Administration on the progress of the harvest has been compiled. By 13 October, grain and pulses, except corn, had been reaped on an area of over 106 million hectare. They have been threshed on 96 percent of the area. Winter crops have been sown on over 35.5 million hectares. Autumn plowing has been carried out on over 87 million hectares. Sugarbeet has been lifted on nearly 3 million ha. This is 82 percent.

PAPER VIEWS EARLY OCTOBER WEATHER, CROPS

PM171400 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 16 Oct 86 p 2

[Agrometeorologist N. Orlova report: "Weather and Crops"]

[Text] In the first 10 days of October cold weather persisted over the USSR's European territory. The average air temperature in the majority of regions was 2-4 degrees below normal, while in the western oblasts of the Ukraine and Belorussia and in the Baltic region it was 1 degree below normal. Frost has occurred everywhere.

East and north of a line linking Tallin, Vitebsk, Bryansk, Orel, Tambov, Saratov, and Orenburg, the vegetative activity of winter grain crops ceased. In the main areas they were in the tillering phase. Over the remaining territory of the European part of the USSR, the growth of winter crops continued. On 14 October it grew warmer over the greater part of the USSR's European territory.

In most of the agricultural regions of Siberia, the prevailing weather was mild for the time of year. In Western Siberia, with the exception of Altay Kray, vegetative activity in winter crops were mainly in the tillering phase. It then became colder here.

In Central Asia and southern Kazakhstan warm, dry weather, favorable for the maturing and harvesting of the cotton crop, persisted for most of the 10-day period. By 10 October 7-9 of the bolls formed had opened in most oblasts, 10-11 in Ashkhabad, Mary, Kashka-Darya, Kurgan-Tyube, and Kulyab Oblasts, and 15 in Surkhan-Darya Oblast. At the beginning and end of the 10-day period there was rain in many cotton growing regions, the largest amounts being in the Fergana valley and Tashkent Oblast, which delayed the opening of bolls and wetted the raw cotton, and this has affected the rate of harvesting.

NOVOSIBIRSK OBLAST GRAIN SALES TARGET FULFILLED

PM200955 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Oct 86 Morning Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Siberian Grain"]

[Excerpt] Novosibirsk -- On 15 October Novosibirsk Oblast working people fulfilled the target for grain sales to the state, having poured 1.25 million metric tons of grain into the granaries. [passage omitted]

SHCHERBITSKIY, MILITARY SIGN GENERAL'S OBITUARY

PM161001 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Oct 86 Second Edition p 4

[Obituary of V.F. Chizh]

[Excerpts] Colonel General, retired, Vladimir Filippovich Chizh died 10 October 1986 after a serious and prolonged illness. [passage omitted] V.F. Chizh was born in 1907 into a peasant family in Staroselye Village in Andrushevskiy Rayon, Zhitomir Oblast. [passage omitted]

[Signed] V.V. Shcherbitskiy, S.L. Sokolov, S.F. Akhromeyev, V.G. Kulikov, P.G. Lushev, A.D. Lizichev, Ye.F. Ivanovskiy, S.K. Kurkotkin, I.M. Tretyak, V.L. Govorov, I.N. Shkadov, V.S. Shevchenko, A.P. Lyashko, A.A. Titarenko, I.A. Gerasimov, Yu.n. Yelchenko, N.V. Goncharov, G.G. Borisov, V.S. Kolesov, V.V. Osipov, V.F. Arapov, A.D. Fomin, M.N. Kalinin, N.S. Bondarchuk, V.D. Lavrinenkov.

MILITIA MAJOR DECORATED FOR BRAVERY 8 OCT

PM130937 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Oct 86 Morning Edition p 2

["USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Decree on the Award of the Order of the Red Star to Comrade V.N. Spirin" -- IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] For courage and selfless action displayed in the execution of official duty the Order of the Red Star is to be awarded to Militia Major Vasilii Nikolayevich Spirin.

A. Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium;

T. Menteshashvili, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Moscow, Kremlin, 8 October 1986.